

# THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the REV. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., MASTER OF THE TEMPLE, c/o S.P.C.K.  
HOUSE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, LONDON, W.C. 2, to whom MSS.  
should be sent.

---

Vol. XXIX

OCTOBER, 1934

No. 172

---

## EDITORIAL

THE second number of *Æcumenica* maintains the promise of the first. Mr. Humphry Beever writes temperately and with knowledge the first instalment of a discussion of Queen Elizabeth's "Catholic prudence" and of Anglican Orders. It is very desirable that continental readers should be familiar with the facts that he presents, and there is not a little in what he says which is likely to be new to them. Archdeacon Storr has a discriminating, friendly article on the Oxford Movement, in the course of which he also contrives to include a great deal of useful general information. This is followed by "La Renaissance Eucharistique Anglicaine," by Dr. Brilioth, which is a chapter from his recent book *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*. There is a charming account by Father Trenholme of Father R. M. Benson. It will help its readers towards the spiritual counterpart of what has been called "the godlike intoxication of braced muscles in the sunshine." To be reminded of one so strong, so holy, so untiring is a spiritual tonic. The Chronicle includes a well-informed discussion of German Church affairs by the Rev. J. O. Cobham and Mr. R. J. C. Gutteridge ("dont l'étude sur l'Allemagne moderne dans *Theology* a été fort remarquée"), comments on the services rendered to religion by "le *Times*," and on events at Liverpool and in many European countries. The *Comptes Rendus* cover much ground, and if to the Editor of this Journal it seemed at first sight a little impersonal, a little dashing to an author's pride, to read in a review of his own book that "ce qu'on nous a donné c'est l'histoire de l'Eglise d'Angleterre," that, after all, is how they do these things in France. As Mr. Mason's M. Hanaud would say, "Your idiom. I know him."

---

Among the most important things in the number is a comparison by Dr. Nicholas Zernov of East and West. He finds that the doctrines about which there is fundamental agreement are



expressed very differently. The Easterns maintain what Professor Aulén has called the classical theory of the Atonement, and so attach a supreme and overwhelming importance to the Feast of Easter. They prefer to say that Christ rose again for us that we might enjoy a new life of holiness and immortality rather than that Christ died for us that our sins might be forgiven. Thus grace is thought of as life rather than as pardon. The Church is the whole body of the faithful, who possess this life. "Orthodoxy" is concerned with true and worshipful communion with the Spirit, rather than with the *lex credendi*. The word "Catholic" is used in a less institutional sense than in the West. The Slavs render "catholique" by "*soborny*", expression intraduisable, pour laquelle aucune langue occidentale n'a d'équivalent: les mots solidarité, symphonie, synthèse, intégralité, etc., ne sont que des approximations. Le fameux théologien russe Khomiakov décrit la *sobornost* une unanimité dans la liberté." This interpretation of catholicism has kept them from seeking uniformity, and has made the Oriental Christians "une grande famille ou fédération d'Eglises égales entre eux, indépendantes, unies par une foi et un amour communs, sans pourtant avoir d'organisation centrale ou de chef suprême." So far, in speaking of the West, Dr. Zernov has meant chiefly the Roman Catholics. It then appears that "du point de vue oriental, le corps ecclésiastique le plus catholique dans l'Ouest serait l'Eglise anglicaine." There are differences, not to be denied, in the matter of apostolical succession, Church authority, tradition, and the distinction between clergy and laity. Yet the moral is that East and West need one another, and that we must lay aside every suspicion and the self-centredness that so easily besets us, and run with patience the race towards unity that is set before us.

---

*Convictions*, edited by Canon Hodgson and published by S.C.M. (8s. 6d.), is an indispensable handbook for workers in the cause of Christian Reunion. It is a map of the regions to be conquered. It contains a selection from the "Responses of the Churches," which were made to the Reports of the Lausanne Conference. The Responses themselves are tough material, but it is a necessary part of the process that the Churches, apart from the inspiration of the (almost) Ecumenical conference, and lacking those social stimuli which at conferences sometimes darken counsel by politeness, should hammer out on their own anvils the shape of their own replies to a great appeal. Rome is of necessity silent, having taken no part at Lausanne, but it is disappointing that we have so little from the Orthodox. It



seems that they are waiting for the Panorthodox Synod, and that this cannot be held till the circumstances of the Church of Constantinople, which exercises a traditional initiative in these matters, have become more favourable. Let us hope that a definite response may be available before the next Lausanne Conference in 1937. For the rest, the material—to an Anglican wishing only that his Church may be suffered to contribute what it has to the United Church—must seem rather tough. Only a very few points can be indicated here. There is a large measure of agreement that “the Ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church,” that the two Sacraments of the Gospel are necessary, and that the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds are *sui generis* and, so to speak, irreplaceable. The rocks of offence are such things as these: the Society of Friends, though it possesses, as some will be surprised to hear, a threefold ministry (Overseers, Elders, Ministers), still rejects the sacramental ordinances. There is no sign that, as has sometimes been suggested, if it should appear that sacramental religion had become a more spiritual thing than it was in the intolerant seventeenth century, they might feel that it fulfilled their requirements. They still reject, and the English Methodists hope that the observance of the Sacraments will not be made so indispensable in the united Church that the Friends could find no place therein. The English Methodists also found it necessary to make these two rather curious affirmations: “(a) That the object of our faith is not any statement about Christ, but the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. (b) That the Creeds have the negative function of excluding error, rather than the positive function of defining truth.” The English Congregationalists “cannot agree that episcopal ordination should be essential to the exercise of the ministry in any united Church of which they as Congregationalists are to form part.” They even wish “that it were possible to avoid the use of this historic term, which, just because it is historic, cannot fail to suggest and perpetuate ideas . . . from which we entirely dissociate ourselves.” The American Baptists, while agreeing that “God wills unity,” cannot agree that “the division of Christendom into churches or denominations is of itself to be deplored, nor that the organic union of all Christians is an object to be sought for its own sake.” The Church of Scotland makes an alarming suggestion which, if adopted, would invalidate the whole harvest of Lausanne. Speaking of the famous words in which Lausanne hoped that it might be found possible to conjoin the episcopal, the presbyteral and the congregational forms of Church Order, they suggest in passing that this might mean that “sections of the Church, attaching sole importance to one ‘element’ or the other, should



follow their own rule, and that the ministry so constituted, albeit ordained under different systems, should be regarded as one universal ministry." They reject this interpretation for themselves, but it seems not impossible that others, less ecclesiastically-minded than the Presbyterians, may take it up. The response of the Church of England (with which may be compared those of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. and of the Church in Wales), though it alone includes a series of minority reports, seems to us excellent, combining in wise proportion firmness and charity. The whole volume will prove indispensable, and, if the difficulties are greater than some of us supposed, why then the necessity for going forward is greater still.

The adjudicators of the Cambridge University Cromer Greek Prize for 1934 have awarded it to Mr. J. R. Watmough for an Essay on "Orphism," which has been published by the University Press. The scholarship of the book, so far as antiquity is concerned, seems unexceptionable. The author has read his authorities with care, and has brought together a great deal of interesting material. His theory is that Orpheus, a religious reformer, may very likely have existed, but that "Orphism" is in the main a reformation of an earlier Dionysiac religion. In fact, it looks like "a spontaneous and indigenous growth in the evolution of almost every religion." Mr. Watmough dislikes reformers, and he has thought fit to elaborate what he calls "the obvious analogy between ancient Orphism and modern Protestantism." It is true that reformers spiritualize religion, but that only means that we may use all the negative part of their work, and discount and even dismiss the positive part of it, making allowance for its religious terminology on the ground that at that time and in those circumstances and from those people little else could be expected. Reformers, "as the Volstead Act has shewn," soon became persecutors. They are anti-social prigs. They irritate and annoy their neighbours. Such conduct, in his belief, is characteristically Protestant. He cannot describe the temporary and intolerant ascendancy of the Pythagoreans at Crotona without comparing them to the Calvinists at Geneva. The parallels are far-fetched. "As the Calvinists were different from the Lutherans, and the Lutherans again from the Huguenots, so the 'Orphism' at Lesbos was different from that at Eleusis, and that at Eleusis from that in South Italy." This only means that the religions of mankind, especially when there has been a reform of an old religion, are not uniform. A comment on "the similarity between *ἐφύγον κακόν, εὖρον ἀμεινον* and the Protestant reformers' doctrine



of being 'saved' " only succeeds in calling attention to a universal feature of all religion. The whole case is very flimsy. All religions have something in common, and all reformations purge and simplify. Mr. Watmough does stop short of one monstrous identification ("Can one fairly claim that mediæval Catholicism was a sinless religion, and that Protestantism, introducing sin for the first time, brought in its train a more hideous eschatology?"), but it seems a disappointment to him that he cannot find this crowning analogy. The fact is that Mr. Watmough knows very little about the Christianity which furnishes the material for his parallel. He has a strange distinction between active grace (Orphic and Protestant) and passive grace (Dionysiac and Mediæval). The Church of England "retains in its Eucharist prayers from the Roman Missal which flatly contradict the spirit of its own rubrics." On the other hand, "the last vestiges of the mediæval Mass remained in such prayers as that 'we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us'—and even these have become refined and spiritualized by time and association." The Catholic Trinity in the Middle Ages was "God, Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary." To-day "the Virginity of Mary is seldom mentioned in Protestant Churches," except, as he remembers to add, "in the Anglican creeds and the liturgies for her holy days." Mr. Watmough is obviously entitled to his view that the proper course is to discard "all traditional forms *qua* traditional forms," because "in the mind of a free and spiritually minded man they can have no real meaning. They are only so much clap-trap—the ready tool of greedy ecclesiastics and unscrupulous politicians." He is no less entitled to deduce these lessons from his Orphic text. But we think it is unfortunate that the learned adjudicators of the Cromer Greek Prize did not consult some competent authorities on mediæval and modern Christianity before awarding their verdict to an essay of which the main conclusion, apart from the ancient facts which it has unearthed, is so sweeping and so ill-informed. We commend to the study of the author another book just published by the Cambridge University Press, Dr. Kenneth Saunders' *The Ideals of East and West*, in which a like investigation of comparative religion is conducted with greater learning and much greater sympathy.

---

Dr. Arthur Burroughs, Bishop of Ripon, was not of the theological and ecclesiastical temper which commonly finds expression in this Journal, and, if he was a habitual reader of its pages, it is probable that they put an occasional strain on his charity. But of that he had good store. He was not by nature



broadminded, but it was manifest that he made great efforts to cultivate the liberal outlook. He had remarkable gifts. As a classical scholar he was quite first-class, but as the years went by he gave himself more and more to pastoral work. Very few have had a stronger sense of vocation, and have worked more untiringly not to be disobedient to the heavenly vision. His letters to *The Times* during the War, though they were rather overloaded with quotations, were admirably written. But their motive was purely evangelistic. His large private correspondence and his many friendships with the young were all governed by one aim, to preach the Gospel. Even his *faux pas* in public speaking were only the occasional infirmities of a very simple and unworldly nature.

---

Is it too late to do justice to the Bishop of Bradford's admirable Charge? It is entitled "C. of E.," and it is published by Messrs. Mowbray. It is scholarly, sensible, shrewd and satisfying. If it be legitimate to adapt a saying often attributed to one whose family name was that of the Bishop's see-city, we are disposed to say that we have read episcopal charges which provoke the reflection—"There, but for the grace of God, goes the Bishop of Bradford."

---

We have received a copy of the Catalogue of the Bede Library (1s., post free 1s. 3d.). The library was founded in 1919, and in 1928 was taken over by the Association for Promoting Retreats. It contains about 10,000 volumes. There is a small fee for membership, which is open to all, and books can be sent by post to country members. Members may use the A.P.R. House and Chapel, and can attend the occasional lectures which are arranged by the Committee. Apply to the Librarian, 36, Eccleston Square, S.W. 1. The library is open 11 to 7 (Saturdays 11 to 2).

---

Canon Lilly's paper was read at the July Conference of the Anglican Fellowship, and "The Proem of the Epistle to the Ephesians" at the Church Councillors' Conference at Swanwick.

---



## THE FAITH OF THE RESURRECTION AS "LIFE IN CHRIST"

THE chief difficulty about the treatment of any particular Christian doctrine is that the doctrine cannot be isolated without leaving a sense of artificiality and impoverishment in the treatment. Theology indeed is a corpus, but it is a *corpus animatum*, not a corpse on the dissecting-table. Our study of it can never afford to be anatomical, a study of its mere intellectual articulations. It must be rather of the nature of a biology which has had to dispense altogether with the aid of anatomy, an attempt to divine the single life of the whole as it functions with a variety which is more apparent than real in the constituent parts. This is most obviously true of the distinctively Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. As the Incarnate Life is for faith a single whole, so every attempt to explicitate that faith must preserve the wholeness. Every moment of that life is *ex hypothesi* miraculous, in the sense of being a manifestation of the eternal within the temporal. Some moments may have been more evidential for the faith of the immediate contemporaries of Jesus, more productive of their faith, than others. Similar differences of evidential value may subsist for, and in, the evocation of the specifically Christian faith today. But once that faith has been achieved, or rather in so far as it has been achieved, it forces the mind to affirm the miraculous equivalence of eternal and temporal in every moment of the Incarnate Life.

But, again, just because the Incarnation is itself thus miraculous, it cannot be a self-contained doctrine. It in turn depends upon a theology, a doctrine of God. It is true that during the last fifty years or so the position has been almost reversed. At any rate in all theology written in the English language there has been an increasing tendency to hold that all our knowledge of God is derived from Christ or at least mediated through Him, that we have seen in Him and nowhere else the express image of the Father. God, the argument runs, has revealed Himself uniquely and perfectly in His incarnate Son, and therefore the perfected doctrine of God is dependent upon that Revelation. But the measure of truth which such an assertion contains depends in its turn upon the nature and content we assign to Revelation. First of all a Revelation implies a Revealer as already in some sense known. A more perfect Revelation is recognized as such because it has a more perfect correspondence



with the character of the Revealer as already known, however dimly, to those who receive the Revelation. Every Revelation, in other words, is given to an antecedent faith. Secondly, as to its content, Revelation is never completely and fully the vision of the Revealer. It is still given to and apprehended by faith. We are incapable here of the *Visio Dei*. What we are given in Revelation is what we need to know for our salvation. The Incarnation indeed perfectly fulfils that need, but it does not go beyond it. Thirdly, what we are inclined more and more to mean when we say that we can see God only in the face of Jesus Christ, and what seems to be alone in the end warranted by that manner of speech, is that by contemplating our Lord's humanity we can ascend to a knowledge of the Divinity which was associated with it. Here, if we permitted ourselves in it too far, there would indeed be a complete breach with the whole past of Christian theology.

I have indulged myself in these reflections, however, only to shew how next to impossible it is to discuss any one point of Christian doctrine as it were in a state of isolation. We are here dealing with entities which altogether refuse such chemical treatment. You may perhaps justly retort that what you have asked me to do need not entail any wandering from a well-defined track, since you require nothing more than a historical account of the fortunes of a particular doctrine in Christian thought, life and worship. It is true that a history of events can be straightforward and is all the better for being so. But the history of a doctrine, and especially of a religious doctrine, is another matter. For such a doctrine, however simple it may seem, is really composed of many strands, and its history must show both what these strands are and how they came together.

Now the Christian doctrine of Resurrection or of the Risen Life in Christ arose directly out of the fact of Christ's Resurrection. And when I use the word "fact" in this connection I am not concerned with any criticism of the kind or value of the evidence of its having happened which the Gospels afford. All I mean is that what, and what alone, made the first disciples of Christ Christians was their belief that their Master's Resurrection was a fact, something that had happened. How exactly they came by that belief we do not, and I think we cannot, know with certainty. But if they had not believed it to be an actual fact of history, they would never have been Christians themselves, nor would they have had either the desire or the power in a single generation to make converts to their faith over a very large area of the Mediterranean world. But now arises one of those strange paradoxes with which we are always face to face in religious experience, and especially in religious thought. The



more a religious belief takes on the character of a fact of history, an unquestioned historical happening, the more is there at least a tendency for it to lose something of its value for faith. It was impossible, indeed, for reasons which we shall have in a moment to consider, for the fact of the Resurrection ever to lose its sovereign importance for faith. But in so far as it was considered chiefly as a fact, as *the* fact out of which Christianity as a faith had arisen, it itself inevitably endured a certain depression of its character as faith. It was of the things seen, of the things manifested to sight and attested by sight, not of the things unseen which are the province of faith. It is we in whom a more critical attitude towards evidence has induced questionings as to the mode and conditions of the fact who are much more concerned to seek in it a distinctive faith-value.

Yet I do not mean to suggest that because the fact of Christ's Resurrection was accepted as beyond question it therefore lost or could lose altogether its character of, and value for, faith. It had, simply as fact, created or completed the faith in the Incarnate Life. Without belief in the fact that faith could neither have emerged nor continued. But here again paradox, or what may seem to us paradox, reappears. Once faith in the Incarnate Life had become firmly established the fact which alone had authorized it tended in another way to lose something of that aura of mystery which faith always requires. If the Life of Jesus was indeed the manifestation of the Logos made flesh, then the one thing certain about that life was that it could not have been holden of death. The supreme mystery was the death of the Incarnate God, not His rising again. The latter, indeed, was the fact which had made belief in the Incarnation possible, but which also, with the existence of that belief, was seen to be the alone fully necessary and foreseeable element in it. The former still remained a mystery, and to it was gradually but inevitably transferred even that particular adhesion of faith which might have seemed to belong exclusively to the fact of the Resurrection. Faith in the Resurrection was of course faith in Christ's achievement of victory over death. But from a very early period that achievement was recognized by faith in the death itself. "Dominus regnat in ligno" is the most assured and the most characteristic expression of the early Christian faith. The whole measure of the victory is seen by faith in the moment of its real accomplishment on Calvary, as witness, e.g., the phrase in the *Eucharistic Prayer of the Hippolytan Church Order*, "when He was given over to His voluntary Passion, that He might break the bonds of death and rend the Devil's chains, and tread on Hell and give life to the just, and fix bounds and show His Resurrection." Professor A. D. Nock



comments justly on that prayer: "The conquest of death, the harrowing of Hell, the Resurrection, are for its writer implicit in the Crucifixion." The Resurrection is only a shewing forth of what has already been accomplished. And as to the great central act of Christian worship in which the wholeness of Christian faith is expressed, I would wholeheartedly endorse Professor Nock's impressive judgment. "The sacred drama of the Eucharist involves Passion, Death, Resurrection; it is a dramatic re-enacting in mystery of the *opus redemptionis*. Yet whereas in the corresponding mystery ritual there was a passage from sorrow to joy, from darkness to light, there is in the Christian rite no element whatever of joyous reversal of a tragic death by a glorious resurrection. The sacrifice of the Cross is the climax from which any change would be an anti-climax." When he states further that "it has been proved that the Easter observance did not arise at once out of belief in the Resurrection, but developed later by gradual stages out of the Jewish Pascha," I do not possess the scholarship which would enable me to assess the correctness of his statement. But from a man of Professor Nock's immense range of learning in these fields, combined with a singularly sound historical judgment, "it has been proved" means a good deal. And a knowledge of the early liturgies, even if in my own case much more incomplete than it need be, and the clear and impressive survival of their spirit in all the later liturgies and especially in the Roman Mass, certainly prepare one for accepting the truth of a statement which must be at first sight surprising.

It would seem, therefore, from the evidences of early Christian worship, that the specific faith in the Resurrection, the faith in an achieved victory over death, had been taken back into the voluntary Passion and Death of Christ. The fact of the Resurrection might remain in its historical isolation as the unique fact which had first motivated the faith in the *opus redemptionis*, and to which, therefore, that faith ever looked back as its origin. But the faith itself had, if I may so express it, no intervals. It was faith in a single Divine act, and that act had its climax, its point of completion, on the Cross. There the victory had already been achieved in its completeness. The appearances of the Risen Lord certified that victory to the outer vision of the disciples that through it they might gain the inner vision of a faith which would embrace and illumine every moment of the Incarnate Life.

Now it is this inner vision which has been ever since the substance of the life and thought of Christendom, essentially a substance of things not seen. And if I am to speak of these now—*i.e.*, of Christian life and thought—I must speak of them



as the effects of this inner vision of faith, as the body as it were which it created for itself and through which it found expression. And I will conceive of that faith throughout as the specific faith of the Resurrection, the faith of the victory over death. And again I will choose that faith not as if it were one aspect among many, but just because it is the whole of faith; the soul which penetrates with equal power its whole, which includes, embraces, vitalizes what, for the sake of distinctness, we must think of as its parts. And finally, I will try, for the sake of clearness, to group what I have to say about Christian life and thought as an expression of this faith round two main facts and ideas, the Christian life (1) as a way of perfection and (2) as the promise, but a promise only because and only in so far as it was in some sense already also a possession, of eternal life.

Now each of these is and must be both fact and idea. If it were not fact, if it were only idea, it would not have incorporated itself in life at all. And if on the other hand it could have become completely fact, its ideal character, its provocation of thought as we know thought at our human level, would have vanished as unnecessary. Thought would then have become pure contemplation. But fact and idea are for us, creatures of time, indissolubly united. And that union was never more clearly illustrated than in the case of Christian perfection. For the first fact about it is that for the Christian life it emerged, along with it, as the ideal which it must, if not attain, at least ceaselessly strive after. In other words, the pursuit of this ideal *was* the Christian life. Every revival of the Christian life was only a more earnest and sustained attempt to actualize the ideal. The hermits of the Thebaid, the Cœnobites, the Monastic Orders of the West with their frequently recurring reforms, the Friars, the foundation of the innumerable active Orders of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries each pledged to some special form of service towards the world, Quakerism, Moravianism, German Pietism, Methodism, Tractarianism, all are witnesses to this ineradicable character of Christianity as the pursuit of perfection. And the important thing to remember is that this quest had its roots in the faith that the power to achieve it had been already given. Failure in the human quest was disloyalty to the Divinely given power. *Askesis* had no virtue in itself. It established no merit or claim to merit. It was only the due and necessary deadening, mortification, of all that had been found resistant to the Divine power. And the subject of the mortification knew that if he or she were not learning to rejoice in it, it was not accomplishing in him or her its necessary task. The only aim of *askesis* was to liberate the soul into an ever greater and more abounding love



of the Eternal Lover. And that love overflowed, almost necessarily, upon one's fellow-men. The pure contemplative was much more of a *rara avis* than we think. The best contemplatives, like St. Teresa, were what I would call active-contemplative. Contemplation was not for them a state of privilege fenced off from danger. It was only the special form of activity for which certain souls were most suited and to which they were Divinely called. "One rarely finds true contemplatives," St. Teresa tells her nuns, "who are not valiant and resolved to suffer. If they are weak, the first thing our Lord does is to infuse courage into them so that they may fear no trials. I believe that those who lead the active life, when they see that contemplatives occasionally receive consolations, imagine that their life consists of nothing else; yet perhaps you might not be able to bear such trials as theirs for a single day. Our Lord knows for what everybody is suited, and gives each one what is best for her soul, for His own glory, and for the good of her neighbour." That "for the good of one's neighbour" is the permanent background of the contemplative life, even when that life is most dominated by the "solus cum solo" attitude. The "solus cum solo" represents only the continuous consciousness of whence power comes and the continuous resort to that source of power. It is life become prayer. It is intensiveness of life without consciousness of extension. And yet it has the sure faith that the intensiveness of its activity has the utmost possible extensiveness, that it avails to the uttermost frontiers of humanity. The contemplative life is directed solely to God, but to God in His whole redemptive purpose for man. It is an intensive union with that redemptive will. Hence the peculiar mode of its activity. The truth is that the fully Christian life, the life issuing from the Resurrection faith, always is and must be both contemplative and active. But in the contemplative life the whole stress of effort is inward and upward, an *ascensio mentis in Deum*, an effort to attain the timeless stillness and peace of perfect union with the Divine Will, and the outward activity of such a life is the effortless radiation of the energy there acquired.

In the active life, on the other hand, the chief effort is outward. Its activity is localized, specified, defined, materialized. And all this labour of rich embodiment of beneficent purpose with the careful economy of effort it requires must be the subject of a strictly autonomous kind of thought and meditation. Yet it too depends and knows that it depends for its due fulfilment upon the quite regular renewal of the sources of its power in periods of retirement into the inner stillness. Besides, in the fullest and richest Christian lives, it is difficult to say which



predominates, even where one form or the other has been deliberately chosen. St. Benedict founded his Rule on a frank recognition of the complementary character of the two modes. St. Teresa aimed directly at the recovery of pure contemplation and was nevertheless one of the most natively shrewd and capably active souls whom Christendom has known. Of St. Francis de Sales or St. Vincent de Paul, and above all of St. Francis of Assisi, it may be said that in them action and contemplation were so blended as to have become one life-substance. To put it more concretely, they all leave the impression of going out to the world with the whole of their inner life, of spending it all at every moment and yet gaining by the expenditure. Their lives repeat the miracle of the widow's cruse. Indeed, the most wonderful thing about these wonderful souls is their capacity of enduring physical hardships, privations, sufferings, which in ordinary men and women would for the moment arrest energy altogether and perhaps permanently rebuke its quality, without in their case a single ruffle being left on the equable surface of their selfless activity. "Ohne Hast, ohne Rast" may be the æsthetic ideal of the perfect energy for the vision of the poet. In them it seems a simple, unconscious achievement.

Now it is the existence of such souls, and among them St. Vincent de Paul is always nearest to my mind and my involuntary homage, that at once poses and gives the concrete answer to the problem of the nature of Eternal Life, that problem which has always exercised the mind of the Christian theologian. The problem, of course, is the relation of time and eternity. We reach haltingly after the conception of eternity by the aid of a definition, say that of Boethius which the classical Christian theology accepted as its own: "Eternity consists in the completely simultaneous and perfect possession of interminable life." Of time we need no definition. We are too concretely aware of it. The thoughts and feelings, the hopes and aims, the affections and strivings which are ours, emerge and disappear and reappear in continuous succession. There may also be a "we" logically antecedent to the "ours." And those "we" may be spiritual natures which *as* natures are independent, ideally independent, of any before and after, sharers in the *ævum* of St. Thomas. But those natures as they are concretely known to us are filled by these experiences of time. They are ineradicably stamped by its seal. It is in and through time that they get or seem to get all their richness, their fulness of content, their concrete "thickness," as William James used to call it. And the question is, is the *ævum* a mere abstraction, a mere deduction of the reason, or is it, or rather has it not always been,



an experience also, an experience which, however dim and remote, is actually authenticable? If the answer can be yes, then already within this pinfold of time we have had authentic intimations of eternity.

Now such experiences, if they occur at all, will be so rare and fleeting as to be beyond the range of exact description. They will not pause for seizure by an exact process of thought. But some chance trick of common speech, some photographic flash of metaphor, may betray their existence, and their existence as much less rare and much less narrowly specific than we had at all suspected. Consider for instance the significance of the description of some intense joy as rapture. There is indicated an experience of being carried for a moment quite out of self, of all that we ordinarily feel as self, and yet also of being carried into a larger and wider self which is also a more intensely real self. And then consider again, as we can more easily, the antecedents of such an experience. It always issues from some long, sustained and costing effort, from an unreserved expenditure of self. And it is not enough to describe it as the crowning of effort. All the strain of effort is carried on into the stillness of achievement and abides there in it. Further, there must be fulness of joy in the effort, it must be fully voluntary, if this mystic joy is to emerge as the very substance of achievement. Now in such an experience time and all its conditions seem lost for a moment in the abidingness of eternity, or rather seem to have been absorbed into that abidingness in such a way as to have gained their fulness of value. And such an experience need not be specifically religious. It can emerge in any sphere of human endeavour to which the will is joyously and unreservedly pledged. Or again, think of another of these spontaneous metaphors, which are just attempts to photograph an otherwise unseizable situation. When the mind is engrossed in its subject, when it is in its tensest mood of activity, time seems, we say, to stand still. We lose all count of its measured beat, even of its very existence as a condition of our experience. We live for a moment in a timeless region in which process and result are one perfect whole. In such moments we cannot help the feeling that we have gained, or been granted, some dim and distant analogue of the *totum simul* of the Divine experience. They give us at any rate the key to the possible reality of that mystic union of which the great contemplatives have testified.

But we can never afford to forget two things, first that time is our only human mode of apprehending eternity, of apprehending it, I mean, vitally; and secondly that if in and through time we have not somehow thus vitally laid hold on eternity, then time itself is for us empty and worthless succession. It is



the sand slipping through our fingers. "I ought," says St. Teresa, "to write with both hands in order not to omit one subject for another." I too feel that I have reached a point where something of the Saint's coveted ambidexterousness might be useful. Nothing may be so dangerous for us as to talk or think too lightly of eternal life here or of mystical contemplation as if to have heard of them were to know all about them. It is certainly not the contemplatives themselves who would mislead us here. For them, contemplation was an art, as Raymond Lull expressly describes it, the art of using time, of extracting from it its richest and most enduring content. But it was the art of conquering succession by enduring it. Less than any others did they make any attempt to alter or modify the material content of time. They accepted that content just as it came in all its outward semblance of help or hindrance, and they accepted it joyfully as the Divinely appointed means of their purification and of the service which only as purified they could render. If time in some rare moment had been transmuted into an indescribable ecstasy, they knew it was still time, stamped indeed for that moment with the seal of eternity, but passing back again into the familiar mode of succession. And so they could teach us who are pledged to the active life to take time seriously, to take it as the indispensable instrument of the making of embodied soul. We indeed treat the material content of time differently, and we are called to do so. That is the appointed mode of our service. We shape the things of time to the satisfaction of passing needs or to some larger purpose of good as we with the best and most sustained effort of thought can conceive that good. And so we are inclined to think that we are taking it more seriously than they, or perhaps on the other hand that we are more exposed to the danger of being fatally caught in its meshes. Neither is true. Equally with us they know the indispensable value of its discipline and the danger of its most subtle seductions. All service, all anxious obedience to His will, ranks the same with God; and all such obedience must be woven by us out of the very stuff of time.

And now comes what the other hand has been waiting to write. It can be written very briefly. No service which is a fully conscious service of the Divine Will, which is consciously dependent on its enablement by Divine Grace, is without some sense, some accompanying benediction, of an eternal quality. The benediction consists in this, that time has already become in our hands the *arrhabo*, the earnest-money, of eternity. We have already a hint of possession of that whose promise will be fully satisfied only hereafter.

What, then, I have been trying to shew is that the faith of



the Resurrection, the faith which grew out of the Resurrection of our Lord regarded as a fact which undoubtedly happened, a fact attested by His visible appearance at different times to different groups of His disciples after His death on the Cross, was from the first and became increasingly a faith in a new kind of life made possible for men, a life which they described as a "life in Christ," an actual sharing in the quality of the Incarnate Life. This new, risen life was a gift, but paradoxically it had also to be attained by an effort more costing and consistent than that needed for the attainment of any other human end. It was a gift of quite authentically Divine power, and just because it was such a power that was given it needed more than a petty human effort to utilize it, to make it actual. Therefore this faith manifested itself in the pursuit of a perfection which might be an offering the least unworthy possible of Him to Whom it was offered. In this pursuit certain elect souls, both men and women, had occasionally gained an authentic feeling of eternity within time, of an eternal quality in their time-experience. This occasional experience was interpreted as being the key to the constant unchanging experience of the Incarnate Life in time and also as a foretaste, the only adequate foretaste, of the mode of the soul's life after death. Finally, as the Incarnate Life was thus conceived as in its every moment a supremely costing and equally a supremely victorious conversion of the temporal into the eternal, a triumph of all the forces of life over all the forces of death and a triumph over them not by evading their assault, but exactly by enduring it in its utmost intensity of malice, we need not be surprised if this faith expressed itself from the first and still continues to express itself in an act of worship which finds the victory in the Cross. *Dominus regnat in ligno.* And when we say *regnat* we have already said both *resurrexit* and *ascendit*. We have found the eternal present of both already on Calvary.

A. L. LILLEY.

---

## STANDING FOR THE PSALMS

IN a study called *Sitting for the Psalms* and published by the S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, I gave evidence to shew that the irreverent habit has appeared in all ages in spite of continual protests from such men as Cæsarius of Arles and St. Peter Damien, and of repeated monastic injunctions to preserve the principle of standing for praise, even if older monks might be allowed to sit at certain times in the longer services.



I collected further instances of how, when the irreverence of Renaissance Rome and English Puritanism invaded the English Church, the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century slowly but gradually brought about a better state of things. Since then I have come across more evidence which I think is interesting.

## I

It would probably be easy to get many more illustrations from the Middle Ages. Thus, in addition to the rules of various orders I quoted, there might be added that of St. Fructuosus of Braga (Migne, *P.L.*, lxxxvii., col. 1,100), who says that in winter after the Office has been sung all are to sit (*sedentibus cunctis*) while one in their midst reads a book, implying that they had been standing to sing the Psalms; or the rule for Virgins given by St. Donatus, Bp. of Besançon (*Sancti Donati Vesontionensis Episcopi Regula ad Virgines*, *ibid.*, col. 281), in his ch. xvii., "On the rule of chanting in the oratory":

"Therefore let us consider how we should be in the sight of the Divinity and his angels and so let us stand that our mind may be in concord with our voice. During the singing of the psalms it is altogether forbidden to chatter (*fabulare non licet*)."

Further, it is interesting to notice that seven years after the Visitation of Exeter Cathedral made in 1330, an Ordinale was issued which in ch. xviii. settled the question "when standing and when sitting is right" (*quando stare et sedere debent*). It said that the clerks were to stand all through the year at Vespers, except during the singing of the responsories, at Compline, and at Matins, except during the lessons and responds. The top row might sit on week days except for the Glorias. At feasts of nine lessons the different rows might take it in turns to stand. All were to stand on feasts of the Virgin; on the less solemn vigils of the dead they might sit. All were to stand at Prime, and the boys were never to sit except while the lessons and responsories were sung, and during the verses, Graduals, and Alleluias at Eastertide.

No doubt this stopped those who did not fear "to exercise irreverently and damnably certain disorders, laughings, gigglings, and other breaches of discipline," which had included, we read, throwing "drippings and snuffings from the candles" on those who stood in the lower stalls.

Again, we read that an incontinent nun at Norwich was condemned to "sit for a whole month below all the other nuns, and to repeat during that period the psalter seven times over"; but, on the other hand, an incontinent clerk at Ripon was



ordered to "stand or kneel in the service, with head and feet bare, reading the Psalter at the Church font, for three Sundays." But neither of these can be said to be examples for us to follow.

## II

I have found it difficult to discover what people actually did in church at the time of the Reformation, but evidently they, as we should say, "behaved very badly." We read in Cranmer's *Remains* (H. Jenkyns, Oxford, 1833, vol. ii., p. 231), that in 1549 he answered the objection of the Devonshire Rebels that the new Service was "but like a Christmas Game" by replying:

"It is more like a game and a fond play, to be laughed at of all men, to hear the priest speak aloud to the people in Latin and the people listen with their ears to hear, and some walking up and down in the church saying other prayers in Latin and none understanding other."

So in his *Articles of Visitation* in 1548, though there is no question about standing or sitting in those which refer to the Offices, in Art. 72 (*ibid.*, p. 194) he asks:

"Item, whether any have used to commune, jangle, and talk in the church, in the time of the Common Prayer, reading of the homily, preaching, reading or declaring of the Scripture."

Evidently the main problem was how to get people first to attend to, and then to take part in, the service. The first thing was to get them to "sit still."

So Bp. Hooper (*Later Writings*, Parker Society, 1852, p. 145) in his *Interrogatories and examinations of the Ministers and of their conversations to be required and shown by the parishioners*, 1551-2, a "true Coppey" of which is in Dr. Williams' Library, asks:

"XVIII. Item, whether they sit at one part of the service, kneel at another, and stand at another, as they were wont to sit when they said or sang the Psalms, kneel at Kyrie Eleyson, and stand up at Magnificat, Te Deum laudamus, and Benedictus; the which alterance of their gesture caused the people to think that the hearing of the service were sufficient."

For Hooper's main desire seems to have been that they should be able to hear and take part in the service. In his *Interrogatories for Gloucester and Worcester Dioceses*, 1551-2 (W. H. Frere, Alcuin Club Collection xv., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, p. 299), he asks:

"45, Whether they say one part of the service softly and with a small voice, and the other part with a loud voice, as they were wont in the time of the Latin Service to say the Pater Noster at the beginning with a small and still voice and the Psalms with a loud voice."



Then the words quoted above are repeated. "It is not clear," notes Dr. Frere, "whether Hooper meant him to stand or kneel for the whole service."

On February 6, 1567, Bishops Grindal and Horn wrote from London to Henry Bullinger and Rodolph Gualter (*Zurich Letters*, Parker Society, 1846, vol. i., Letter lxxv., p. 178):

"We do not assert that the chanting in churches, together with the organ, is to be retained; but we disapprove of it as we ought to do."

If this refers to the chanting of the Psalms, such men would clearly not care whether the congregation stood or sat, though they would almost certainly have remained sitting themselves.

Five years later things were no better. In the first Admonition to Parliament (June 30, 1572) the writer complained (§ 13) that:

"They tosse the psalmes in most places like tennice balles. The people some standing, some walking, some talking, some reading, some praying by themselves, attend not to the minister. He againe posteth it over as fast as he can gallop; for either he hathe two places to serve; or else there are some games to be played in the afternoone, as lying for the whetstone, heathnishe dauncing for a ring, a beare or a bull to be baited, or else jack an apes to ride on horssebacke, or an enterlude to be plaide, and if no other place can else be gotten, it must be done in the church. Nowe the people sit and now they stand up. When the old Testament is read, or the lessons, they make no reverence, but when the gospel cometh, they al stand up."

Then follows much more about bowing, bellringing and organs. To all this Whitgift in his *Defense of the Answer to the Admonition, against the reply of Thomas Cartwright*, made in 1574 (*Works*, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853, vol. iii., p. 384ff.), defends antiphonal singing and declares that "standing or sitting at this time or that time is indifferent, and therefore may both be well used and abused also." He seems here to refer to the standing up for the Gospel and at the name of Jesus, but that the general irreverence continued during the singing of the Psalms is evident from another passage in the *Second Admonition to Parliament*, where we read:

"For thoughe they have manye guises, nowe to knele, and nowe to stande, these be of course and not of any pricke of conscience, or piercing of the heart most commonly. One he kneeleth on his knees, and this way he loketh, another he kneeleth him self a slepe, another kneeleth with suche devotion, that he is so farre in talk, that he forgetteth to arise till his knee ake, or his talke endeth, or service done——"

"And therefore another hath so little feeling of the common prayer that he bringeth a booke of his owne, and though he sitte when they sitte, stand when they stande, kneele when they kneele, he may pause sometime also, but moste of all he intendeth his own booke, is this praying?——"



"Again, the Psalmes be all red in forms of prayer, the people seldom make them, they thinke some of them straunge geare, and for all that they are but only red, and scarce red sometimes."

No doubt this was carrying individualism and spontaneity of worship too far, but the Puritan ideal seems to have been to get them to keep quiet and to sit down, much as vergers in our Cathedrals may be seen (not at Chester) "shooing" sightseers into seats lest they should walk about in the nave while a service is going on in the choir behind a heavy screen and a drawn curtain which cuts them off from all participation in it.

### III

This did not satisfy the Anglo-Catholics of the Laudian revival. Cosin saw the evil and helped to plan the reform. In his *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, first series (*Works*, Oxford 1855, p. 54), printed in 1619, under the heading "The Psalms sung standing and the Hymns," he quotes Amalarius (780-851, *De Eccles. Off.*, iv., c. 3) as saying that we sing psalms standing to shew our attitude of mind, which is that we are ready to subdue our flesh, and Durandus, "because we are praising God," and refers to Cassian, adding "and the notes of that place produce many more testimonies of the ancients to that purpose." Had he, I wonder, been reading the comments of Alardus of Gaza, reprinted in Migne, which must have been recently published and which betray the same irritation at the irreverent custom of sitting then becoming established in the Church of Rome.

So in his Third Series of Notes (p. 445) he writes:

"*And our mouth shall shew forth thy praise.* This is the answer of all the people. In the 2d book of Ed. VI, the word 'Choir' is everywhere put for our word 'Answer,' and by making this answer, they promise here and undertake for themselves, that they will not sit still to hear the psalms and hymns read only to them, as matter of their instruction; but that they will bear a part in them with the priest, and keep up the old custom of singing and answering verse by verse."

Cosin saw clearly the principle that was at stake.

Laud, who, no doubt, saw the principle equally clearly, had the practical task before him of getting it put into effect. But he was content at first with less. He concentrated his efforts on getting men to kneel for prayer, to take off their hats, and to stand at least for the Creed. So in his *Articles to be inquired of in the first visitation of the Rt. Reverend Father in God William Laud, Bishop of St. Davids in the yeere of Our Lorde 1622* (*Works*, vol. v., Oxford, 1853, p. 388), he asks:

"Concerning the Parishioners. Whether any there be—who come late to church, and depart before service be done upon the said days?"



Or who do not reverently behave themselves during the time of divine service, devoutly kneeling, when the general confession of sins, the litany, the ten Commandments, and all prayers and collects are read, and using all due and lowly reverence when the blessed name of Jesus Christ is mentioned, and standing up when the Articles of the Belief are read; or who do cover their heads in church during the time of divine service, unless it be in case of necessity, in which case they may wear a night-cap or coif. Or who do give themselves to babbling, talking, or walking, and who are not attentive to hear the word preached, or read: or reading or praying during the time aforesaid?"

These words are repeated later in his *Interrogatories for Canterbury, Lichfield, Winchester, Worcester, London, Wells, and Bristol*. For Gloucester, he adds (d. 480):

"that the bodies of cathedral churches should be not pestered with standing seats, contrary to the course of cathedrals, and the dignity of those goodly piles of buildings, we must and do require you, that all standing and fixed seats, as well as those where the Mayor and Alderman's wives use to sit, as other between the pillars, be taken down, and other moveable ones put in their rooms."

Those for the Mayor himself and for the Chaplain are to remain. If only his order could be applied to our parish churches, ruined as they so often are by heavy and fixed unsuitable seating!

Laud saw, too, the importance of the right kind of music. At Salisbury his *Visitation Articles* (p. 461) asked:

"VIII. Item, whether there is care had that men of skill and good voices are chosen into your quire and that the voices be seated everyone in his place, so that there be not more of tenors therein, which is an ordinary voice, than there be of basses and counter tenors, which do best furnish the quire? And whether you have in your quire a fair and tuneable pair of organs and a skilful organist to play thereon?"

Choirmasters of to-day will look back with envy on those "good old times" when tenors were "ordinary voices"!

But Laud's efforts did not meet with immediate success. On June 23, 1649, we read in the diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin (edited for the Royal Historical Society by E. Hockliffe, Camden Third Series, vol. xv., 1906) that he went to church at Easter Colne and found strange customs still continued. He writes (p. 76):

"Ye Lord was good to me on the Sabbath, in ys word preacht and opened. Ye unreverent carriage of divines in sitting with yr hatts on when the psalm is singing is strange to me";

and we find that many of the clergy at the Restoration justified these "unreverent" practices and resented this undoing of the work of the Reformation as it would be described to-day. Thus in *Reasons shewing the necessity of Reformation*, etc., by divers



ministers of sundry countries in England, 1660 (quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, Pt. II, de la More Press, 1903, p. 252), we read:

“Upon these and other reasons it was, that many ceremonies introduced into the mass-books and other popish breviaries such as ducking and bowing to the east, to the altar, the standing up at Gloria Patri, or ‘Glory be to the Father,’ etc., at the reading of the Gospel of the day,”

and the list of “popish gew-gaws and outward pompous toys that please the senses” grows so long that what they did or what happened to them disappears.

In 1661 the Convocation of York acted. In the *Propositions exhibited in the Convocation of York*, December 13, 1661, by P. Samwayes, “doctor of divinity, proctor for the clergy of the archdeaconry of Chester and Richmond, and by the whole court approved and decreed to be transmitted to the lord archbishop, and the rest of the bishops of the province of York, now resident at London; to be communicated (if they think fit) to the other convocation of Canterbury now convened at Westminster, London” (Ex. MS. Guil. Sancroft, Arch. Cant. penes Tho. Tanner, episc. Assaven (in the Bodleian Library, Oxford). Printed in Wilkin’s *Concilia Magnæ Britannicæ*, vol. iv.) and quoted by J. Parker, *An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer* (Oxford, 1877, p. ccccxxxi), we find it asked:

“IV. Were it not requisite and much conducive to the peace of the Church that *standing* at the Psalms and Hymns, and the recital of the Gloria Patri, etc., were enjoined, as well as at the rehearsal of the Creed? that what *laudable custom* hath in so many places *taken up*, Canon might on all *impose*, especially seeing the psalms are commonly made up of prayers and praises, which are not so comely in the mouth of a sitter as a stander.”

What Convocations were urging as “laudable customs” divines were justifying on deeper grounds. I have quoted the words of Sparrow, Jeremy Taylor, Bingham, and Wheatly in my *Sitting for the Psalms*. To these may be added Herbert Thorndike, who wrote in his *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, 1670, ch. xli. (*Works*, Oxford, 1854, vol. v., p. 583):

“There is a fuller reason why our schismatics would not have the Psalms used or sung standing. For there are even religious persons and orders in the Church of Rome that use it so; and they are not wont to disquiet the laziness of their friends. But our men would not have any psalms but the Geneva psalms to be an office of God’s service; choosing rather to exclude an office of God’s service out of the Church, of more consequence a great deal than the hearing of sermons than that their own wilfulness should not give law to it.”



But it was not only Bishops and Curates who wrote; the "people committed to their charge" took up the parable. In 1682 a book appeared entitled *Advice to the Reader of the Common Prayer and the People attending the same*. By a well-meaning (though unlearned) Layick of the Church of England. On p. 25 he writes:

"As for the *repetition of the Psalms in course*, I have hinted what is needful before: only let me remember, that none should take liberty to sit in that performance, except constrained by bodily infirmity; because standing is so much more fit a posture for the Office of Thanksgiving; and sitting was counted so indecent in Primitive Times, that the whole service was called a *Station*; and is only indulged now for bodily weakness; and not ordered, because of the great decay of Piety, which will not bear such strictness."

I doubt if his inference from the use by the Early Church of the military term "statio" can be maintained, though undoubtedly in those days men stood for the singing of the Psalms, as for the prayers. But he clearly sees that to stand is a matter of general reverence, and he earnestly admonishes "all men to avoid sitting, lolling, leaning and all indecent postures," asking:

"Can any man think it fit to supplicate the Infinite Majesty of Heaven and Earth in any but the most humble posture of body, which with us is kneeling; or that we ought to sit on our Breeches when we sing or speak praise to him? Certainly the power of Errour is very great, that it can blind the mind of man in a matter so evident and plain."

In his second edition, which followed in the next year, he made some slight alterations and added an *Application to the Clergy and the People*. He urges a weekly Communion, "which the rubric most plainly orders, but is omitted even in most Cathedrals," and declaims against that "offensive and indecent behaviour that I have observed in some" who only come to church for the sermon, and "sit, and loll, and stare about as much as they can, to seem unconcerned in what is done." But, he adds, he never observes any such behaviour where the Minister sets a good example and is "devout in reading the service." He gives a list of churches in London in which there is a daily service, sixteen in all where Matins is said at hours varying from 6 to 12, and Evensong from 3 to 6, as well as five more with only one service each day.

He reinforces his word with a reference to Thomas Comber's *Companion to the Temple*, published in the same year:

"Let them compose their bodies into those most reverent postures which the Church hath suited to every part of duty."



## IV

But the question was not finally settled even in the next generation. In 1707 Thomas Bennett published his *Paraphrase with Annotations upon the Book of Common Prayer*, in which (p. 35) he wrote:

"Standing is certainly a very proper posture for the Praises of God. For everybody, not only hears them, but ought to bear a part therein. Now though sitting may be allowed, when we only hear, as whilst Lessons etc., are read, yet since in Praises every member of the Congregation, is not barely passive, but also active and imployed; therefore such a posture becomes their being concern'd in that part of worship, and 'tis notorious that their standing up together, looks as if they had something to do themselves, and that they were not merely attending to others."

So he continues:

"Kneeling is not a proper posture for such parts of the Psalms as are not directed to God; and sitting is a most indecent posture for such parts as are directed to him, as all sober christians confess; but standing does tolerably well suit both parts, though it is not the very best for one of them, and therefore, since both these parts . . . are so commonly, and so suddenly altered, mingl'd and interwoven the one with the other, that the most suitable postures for each of them cannot be always used, certainly that one posture which best suits both ought to be preferr'd, kneeling at the Confession, Absolution and Prayer . . . standing at the Gloria Patri and hymns and creeds, and bowing at the Holy name of Jesus."

which, he says, shews "reverence to God and obedience to our governours, and makes a very comely uniformity."

## V

The bad Puritan tradition had still to be fought in the eighteenth century, as I have shewn elsewhere in my *Sitting for the Psalms*, and in the *Guardian*, August 3, 1934. Between 1715 and 1719 Mr. M. Hole was publishing his *Practical Discourses on the Liturgy of the Church of England* (ed. J. A. Giles, Pickering, 1837). In his twenty-eighth discourse on Ps. xcv. he declares that "it is a great mistake in some persons, that God looks only to the heart, and hath no regard to the outward gestures of the body, which hath occasioned great rudeness and unmannerliness in his service," and Dr. George Hickes, in publishing his *Devotions in the antient way of offices with psalms, hymns and prayers, Reform'd by a Person of Quality* (London, Masters, 1846, reprinted from the fifth edition of 1717), gives definite directions on p. xvii:



"At the end of every psalm let A say 'Glory be, etc.,' and B 'As it was,' both continuing to stand, and shewing some other sign of worship, by bowing the head, or lifting up the eyes to heaven; for in all devotions, the exterior worship is never to be neglected,"

and he blames those

"stiff, morose and saturnine votists, who are so sparing of bodily adoration in our most solemn services by refusing to stand at the singing of Psalms and anthems or to bow to God before his holy altars."

In Scotland Episcopalians seem to have stood as a matter of course. In 1723 there was published a *Persuasive to the people of Scotland in order to remove their Prejudice to the Book of Common Prayer*, by P. Barclay, A.M., second edit., London, (quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, Part II., p. 403). In it we read:

"Both minsters and people, standing as before, read the Psalms appointed for the Day by turns; i.e., the first verse by the Minister, and the next by the People, till the Psalms are all read. If it falls to the Minister to read the last Verse of any Psalm, the Congregation say *Glory be, etc.*, and the Minister answereth, *As it was in the beginning, etc.*, and the People begin the next Psalm; and so on till the Course of the Day is ended."

John Wesley was a great advocate of congregational singing. Among his letters (*Works*, vol. xvi., London, 1813, p. 28) is one to a friend on the advantage of methodistic worship. It is dated September 20, 1757. He neither approved of "bowing and curtsying or of staring about," nor of the "formal drawl of a parish clerk, the screaming of boys who bawl out what they neither feel nor understand, or the unseasonable and unmeaning impertinence of a voluntary on the organ." Nor does he like "the miserable, scandalous doggerel of Hopkins and Sternhold." "One who knows what he is about" does not—

"take just 'two staves,' but more or less, as may best raise the soul to God; especially when sung in well composed and well adapted tunes, not by a handful of wild unawakened striplings, but by a whole serious congregation; and these not lolling at ease, or in the indecent posture of sitting, drawling out one word after another, but all standing before God and praising him lustily and with a good courage."

It is interesting to note that the Lord's Supper was "enlivened by hymns suitable to the occasion."

In quoting Bishop Mant's *Book of Common Prayer* (1824) in my *Sitting for the Psalms*, I could only assume that, when he declared standing to be "a very proper posture for the praise of God," this referred to Psalms as well as Canticles, since he immediately went on to quote the words of Anthony Sparrow's *Rationale* that "when we sing or say these Psalms we are wont to stand." I have since found several more passages clearly



based on other earlier writers, and in his *Book of Common Prayer*, abridged from the edition of 1824 (vol. i., pp. 133-4), which is quoted by J. H. Overton as revealing a "state of things which it is difficult to realize at the present day" (*The English Church in the 19th Century*, Longmans, 1894, p. 131), we read:

"In the singing of the psalms different persons use different postures. The prose psalms, so far as we know are, and have ever been, repeated by all persons everywhere standing. In the verse Psalms we all stand at the doxology."

Apparently the Puritan custom of sitting for the singing of metrical psalms and hymns persisted long after the Catholic custom of standing for the liturgical Psalms had been re-established. And Bishop Mant adds that if allowance must be made for those more reverent persons who shrink from standing while others sit:

"Were it more common than it is it would be far from a dishonourable singularity. But still, as very many in most congregations have by long habit been prejudiced in favour of sitting, or, though they disapprove of the custom, feel a difficulty of quitting it unless every one did, they should not be censured for a practice by which they mean nothing amiss, but kindly encouraged to an alteration of this point which we may thus hope will gradually become general."

And then quoting from a review of a work by Dr. E. Barry in the *British Critic*, vol. xxviii., July-December, 1806, he cites "an amusingly effectual method for inducing his congregation to stand up during the singing" which he had heard of as used by a clergyman. After speaking of the "irreverent posture of sitting down," he added:

"For the aged, the diseased, and the infirm in retaining their seats every apology is to be offered,"

with the result that "at the next psalm all who did not desire to be classified under any of these categories, stood up."

Finally, it is interesting to read in a review of the life of Butler of Wantage in the *Church Times* for April 7, 1933, that

"the life of the Sisters was carefully planned. Offices were said in an upstairs room of the cottage. A blue washed place with sloping roof and roughly boarded floor; the only furniture consisted of the two long desks with sloping sides of bare deal at which *the sisters stood to say offices*. There was room for three or four at most to stand on either side."

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.



## PRAYER TO THE HOLY SPIRIT

OUGHT we, or ought we not, to pray directly to the Holy Spirit? If the Creeds of the Church are true, is not the Holy Spirit worthy of equal worship with the Father and the Son and therefore of receiving direct prayer? May we not, ought we not, to address our devotions to Him in private and also in the public services of the Church?

The Rev. R. H. Moberly, Principal of Bishops' College, Cheshunt, in a Cambridge University sermon printed in *THEOLOGY* for October, 1932, decides against the practice, and he shews that the Church generally has addressed but little prayer to the Holy Spirit. He adds that there has been little attempt at portraying the Holy Spirit pictorially and that the Nicene Creed uses the neuter article, τὸ κύριον. It may be questioned whether his arguments are convincing: i.e. (i.) τὸ is natural and correct with Πνεῦμα, and even if κύριον be translated "sovereign" it is no less personal in implication than the usual "Lord"; (ii.) if direct prayer to the Holy Spirit may lead to Tritheism, perhaps prayer to Jesus Christ has already led to Ditheism; if it is right to pray to our Lord, then on the grounds of logic, of history, and of Trinitarian doctrine we cannot forbid prayer to the Holy Spirit; (iii.) pictorial representation is obviously difficult and limited to the Biblical symbols of a dove and fire, although the human form has been utilized; but is it not also undesirable, if "God is Spirit," and for this reason little attempted?

A more cogent argument against the practice is suggested by Dr. Goudge in a sermon for Whitsunday, in his volume *Sin and Redemption*, i.e. that it is not so natural to pray to the Holy Spirit as to the Father and the Son because He is within ourselves and because it is He who inspires our prayers; but even here it should be noted that the tendency of thought is Tritheistic.

The issue seems to turn in part on the question whether the Holy Spirit is personal or not, and here Mr. Moberly's plea for the idea of the Holy Spirit as life-force, love, bond of union, appears to fall short of the full truth. (There is no need to discuss whether the Holy Spirit is "a" person, or the meaning of Persona or of Personality; it is sufficient to use personal in the same sense as it is used of the Father and the Son.)

The New Testament is quite clear and definite in its use of personal terms and relations, and thereby shews the mind of the Church in the earliest days. In the next generation it is the Person of the Son that is the centre both of controversy



and of doctrinal activity. But a Trinitarian doctrine is involved thereby, and there are therefore at least some allusions to the Holy Spirit; *i.e.* a doctrine of the Holy Spirit is as yet not called for, but it is already implied and exists in germ. The further considerations may be added that (i.) a doctrine of the Church would also be demanded earlier than one of the Holy Spirit because of practical questions of the ministry, of authority and of administration; (ii.) development of doctrine was stopped by the Barbarian Invasion (Abp. Temple at the Cromer Convention, 1932); (iii.) a doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not possible before a real democracy had been developed (*ibid.*); (iv.) this doctrine is much more difficult to frame than a doctrine of either the Father or the Son, because it must be expressed in terms purely spiritual; it would be called for by fewer people; it would therefore be likely to be shelved; for it is always easy to visualize the Father because of earthly analogies, easier still to visualize Jesus Christ because of His humanity, and impossible to visualize a "Spirit"; (v.) there is difficulty in finding an adequate name for those who find "Holy Spirit" vague and impersonal.

However, in spite of this, and even if the West took some time to differentiate between the Logos and the Holy Spirit, there is enough evidence that the personal nature of the Holy Spirit was not lost sight of, either in the East or the West, as a study of the works of the late Dr. H. B. Swete and Dr. A. J. Macdonald will shew; and Dr. Watkins Jones shews the same to be true of the mediæval period. At the Reformation came a great revival of interest in the Holy Spirit, owing partly to the reaction against the authority of the Church, partly to the assertion of the right of the individual judgment and guidance, partly to the rise of national self-determination which was the beginning of democracy, and partly to the interest and study given to Holy Scripture. Here again Dr. Watkins Jones shews that the personal nature of the Holy Spirit was duly recognized. (It was not necessarily ever in question, nor is it urged here that writers were at any time directly interested in this aspect, only that enough passages can be adduced to shew that it was always believed and taught.

The Liturgical evidence has not so far been produced, but *lex orandi* is *lex credendi*, and it should not be ignored. It is certainly true and noteworthy that direct prayers to the Holy Spirit are few, nearly all being addressed to the Father or the Son, even at Pentecost, and in the Ordinals I have found none. These, however, can be quoted:

Come down to us, O Holy Spirit, and make Thy way into our hearts. Comfort us with Thy Presence who bewail our own



infirmity; and those whom Thou seest falling in the way make more strong in Thee. Create in us the fire of Thy love that every spot and fault be done away. In our mouth be truth, in our heart repentance, in our offerings thankfulness, in our self-denial true humility. Kindle the desires of those whom Thou seest keeping fast for Thy coming. Accept our fast and favourably hear the prayers of those who lack both strength and courage. Look on us, Thou who art a consuming fire; burn away the blight of our wrongdoings; then come and impart to us the fullness of Thy grace; cleanse us now from our faults, and when Thou comest take us to Thyself in glory. (Mozarabic, Eve of Whitsunday.)

Holy Spirit, who proceedest from the Father and the Son, come down with Thy favour upon these our whole-burntofferings. According to the promise of the Father, shew to our human hearts the holiness of Thy Presence, and fill with Thy pledged richness those whom Thou seest await Thy promised coming. (Ditto.)

Spirit and Paraclete, who with the Father and the Son remainest in the Trinity one God, come down this day into our minds, that resting on Thine intercession for us we may with full assurance cry out from the earth—Our Father, etc. (Mozarabic, Whitsunday.)

O Holy Spirit, who proceedest from the Father and the Son, enrich us with the gift of Thy blessing; that stablished by Thy free Spirit we may be counted worthy to be set free daily by Thy descent from Heaven. Let Thy blessing, therefore, be upon us, and do Thou ever strengthen us through the untold power of the Trinity; that the Holy Spirit may dwell in us, the right Spirit renew us, the free Spirit stablish us in single witness of their might; and so we may rejoice to be stablished by the Father, renewed by the Son, and guarded by the Holy Spirit. (Ditto, Matins.)

O Holy Spirit, who proceedest from the Father and the Son, teach us to do the truth; that as Thou hast received the Procession from the Father and the Son so Thou mayest join us in an unseen fellowship of love with them from whom Thou proceedest in ways beyond all telling. (Ditto, Vespers.)

O Holy Spirit, who by the manifold gift of tongues didst gather the peoples into the unity of the faith, come, fill the hearts of Thy faithful and kindle in them the fire of Thy love; alleluia, alleluia, alleluia. (Sarum, Vigil of Whitsunday, First Vespers.)



Heavenly King, Paraclete, Spirit of Truth, who art everywhere present and fillest all things, the Treasury of good things and the bestower of life, come and dwell in us, and purify us from every stain, and save our souls, in Thy goodness. (Eastern Church, Midnight Office. Tr. Dr. Bright.)

The Mozarabic Post pridie for Whitsunday is addressed to the Holy Spirit, but is too long to quote; also a prayer at the Confirmation on Easter Eve which is very long and characteristically didactic; and a prayer in the Gregorian Sacramentary at the making of a monk; and some antiphons for Whitsunday in the Roman Breviary.

In the B.C.P. are no prayers addressed to the Holy Spirit excepting those in the Litany and the Lesser Litany, and the Veni Creator in the Ordinal; indeed the recognition of Him is very slight; there is a grudging allusion in the Gloria in Excelsis; there are the Gloria and the Grace; prayers are addressed to the Father to send the Holy Spirit, on Whitsunday, in the Baptismal and Confirmation Services, and the revived Epiclesis (these by themselves might be pressed so as to imply subordination to the Father, and even a Unitarian theology); but there is no octave of Whitsunday or any Sundays named after it (in the Roman calendar all the Sundays following are "after Pentecost").

There are modern litanies to the Holy Spirit in the useful "Cambridge Offices and Orisons," in the late Canon Bullock Webster's "Churchman's Prayer Manual," and in "Prime and Hours"; there are direct prayers in Mr. McCheane's valuable "Church's Year"; and these:

Be present, we beseech Thee, most Holy Spirit of God, in all our studies, researches and undertakings, that by Thine almighty aid we may both know and do the truth.

O Thou Spirit of Him who is the Way and the Truth and the Life, lead us, we beseech Thee, according to His gracious promise into all the truth. Open our eyes that we may see truth; fire our hearts that we may welcome and desire it; give us grace to know it and to make it our own. Direct all our steps in ways of truth and uprightness, and grant that by our truth of life others may be won to Thee.

O Thou Spirit of Him who is the Way and the Truth and the Life, the Light of men and the Saviour of such as believe, guide, we pray Thee, all those who are seekers after truth; help all who are pioneers of the way; and look in pity on those who are perplexed. To all vouchsafe Thy gift of holy wisdom;



grant that in Thy light we may see light; and finally of Thy mercy do Thou bring us to the bliss of eternal life.

(A suggested ending to the Te Deum was printed in THEOLOGY for October, 1932.)

The witness of hymns is quite as definite, and it covers all periods. In addition to the Veni Creator there are Adsis Superne Spiritus and Veni Superne Spiritus (in Newman, "Hymni Ecclesiæ"); Sacrate Veni Spiritus (Mozarabic, Whitsunday, Vespers); the Veni Sancte Spiritus, or "Golden Sequence" of King Robert of France; Qui procedis ab utroque of Adam of St. Victor; O ignis Spiritus Paracliti of St. Hildegard (in Phillimore's *Hundred Best Latin Hymns*). The latter may be rendered:

Fire of the Spirit and Life of all living,  
Holy, Thou givest all creatures their life;  
Holy, when wounded the balm of their healing,  
Holy, their succour when fall'n in the strife.

Breath of the Holy One, Fountain of purity,  
Source of all virtues, more fragrant than May,  
Seeking and saving, true fire of His charity,  
Those who are lost and are out of the way.

Breastplate of life and the girdle of manhood  
Well-knit, in Thee lies the hope of our peace;  
The enemy holds us, but God wills our freedom;  
Guard and defend us and give us release.

Thou art the way to the ends of creation,  
Mighty Thy course through the heavens to run;  
Earth and the very depths open before Thee,  
Ordering and framing and linking in one.

Clouds at Thy bidding fly, rages the tempest;  
Rocks yield their moisture, the rain swells the stream,  
Green is earth's face, and we, taught by Thy wisdom,  
Echo in gladness their undying theme.

Praise be to Thee, the soul of all praising;  
Praise be to Thee, our hope, honour and might;  
Praise be to Thee, O joy of our being,  
Who enrichest Thy saints with the guerdon of light.

In modern hymnbooks these may be noted, of varying date and origin: English Hymnal, Nos. 152, 396, 453, 454; Songs of Praise, Nos. 210, 243, 260, 335; A. and M. Supplement, No. 673; and the list could doubtless be much extended.

In the light of the preceding I would plead strongly for the practice of praying directly to the Holy Spirit, as a logical,



doctrinal and practical necessity (*cf.* R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*, chap. viii.). Our knowledge of God has been progressively revealed, and stages may be traced in the activities of God, *i.e.* the work of the Father in Creation has been succeeded by that of the Son in Salvation, and both have been in a sense achieved though neither is completed; it is the function of the Holy Spirit to complete the work of both Father and Son in continuing and maintaining the life of the created world and in bringing about its salvation and the salvation and the full development of man. It is highly noteworthy that our Catechism speaks of the work of the Father and the Son in the past tense and of that of the Holy Spirit in the present tense (see Question after the Creed, and *cf.* E. L. Mascall in *THEOLOGY*, June, 1933). This is not necessarily to fall into Tritheism or Modalism or the error of Joachim of Floris that the work of the Father and the Son was transitory, though clearly our time-concepts make difficulties for us; unless, as it may be, the Eastern Church is right in allowing prayer only to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit; but if this be strictly held all prayer to Jesus Christ must be ruled out, and this in the light of the past is now not possible; better to allow the natural growth to have its way and to allow prayer to the Holy Spirit as a normal and right practice.

It may even be queried whether we can know God as Father if the Incarnation was needed to reveal Him; we cannot now know God as Son, *i.e.* in the flesh; but we can and should know God as Holy Spirit who possesses, as proceeding from the Father and the Son and as the Spirit of Jesus, the human element of the Incarnation which enables us to find the point of contact (*cf.* H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, chap. v.; R. C. Moberly, *op. cit.*, p. 194).

And if St. John xiv. 26, xvi. 13 be taken at their full value the revelation of God in Jesus was not sufficient; it was in any case limited by the physical humanity of Jesus, whereas there is no limitation to "Spirit." If we want an objective demonstration of the presence of the Holy Spirit, something analogous to the Incarnation, we may find Him in nature, *i.e.* in its order and beauty and wisdom; in the higher elements of humanity, *i.e.* those who have voiced truth and beauty and moral goodness; He may be found in unexpected places and ways; we can and should find Him in the individual Christian and in the Church, which is the Body of Christ, the "Extension of the Incarnation," the natural domicile of His Spirit, and the Sacraments are the means by which the Spirit is normally made available to us.

The world of today is demanding a religion of experience



and it is demanding truth, as in the first days (*cf.* Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 120); witness the growth of the Group Movement and the honesty and the realism of the youth of today, a virtue which is largely responsible for its rejection of a Church whose members have not always been conspicuous for reality in their religion. Personal devotion to the Holy Spirit (in the fullest sense) will supply what is needed; it will be a safeguard against pantheism; it establishes our own assurance (1 John iii. 24); in its moral effects it would cure all human ills. A "Pneumatology" is demanded of the Church today, and it will be discovered in the same way as were the other "-ologies," *i.e.* by being realized first as a fact of experience and by being acted on as real and vital and effective in daily life, and next by being brought into the life of prayer and worship; the formulated doctrine, which may not be shirked even if not many desire it and is a matter for philosophers and theologians, will come last.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.



## MISCELLANEA

### NOTES

#### ORTHODOXY: A LITTLE SYMPOSIUM

A SUGGESTION was made in our columns a few months ago that readers should send definitions of Orthodoxy. The event has not been quite as was anticipated. Two or three short definitions have come in; a letter, a suggested creed, and a rather more elaborate treatment of the subject by Dr. Williams. Together, they make what seems a very interesting series.

##### I

"A loyal and instructed conformity to the dogmatic and theological standards of the Catholic Church. (I cannot think that the sample you gave is objective enough.)"

F. M. DOWNTON.

##### II

"Orthodoxy for an Anglican is a Creed based on the authority of the Church, the Bible, and private judgment illuminated by the Holy Spirit."

E. LYTTTELTON.

##### III

"Orthodoxy is essential agreement with what the Church of all ages has held to be of the essence of the Faith."

ROGER F. MARKHAM.

##### IV

"Bishop Lightfoot, whom you mention with honour in your editorial, ordained the late Dr. Rashdall, knowing that he definitely disbelieved the Virgin Birth. The Dean told me himself that he stated to the Bishop that he did not believe this miracle, though he did believe in the Incarnation. The Bishop replied that he did not see how it was possible to believe in the one without the other—continuing, however, 'but you do not recognize that.' Accordingly he ordained him on the strength of his assurance that he did believe in the Incarnation."

"I remember particularly clearly the phrase, 'but you do not recognize that,' which the Dean enunciated very carefully, and evidently placed between quotation marks by the tone of his voice. Undoubtedly the Bishop held that one who is firmly convinced of the truth of the Incarnation *ipso facto* cannot (in the language of your Editorial) 'intend to teach something other than the teaching of the Church'; that he is 'irresistibly drawn to One who is recognized as the Way, the Truth, the Life' (which you lay down as the basis of orthodoxy); and that he possesses (according to the definition of orthodoxy which you quote with approval) 'the earnest desire . . . to believe as faithfully and to understand as clearly as he can what the Church of his Baptism . . . teaches as true.'"

"Bishop Lightfoot indeed regarded certain more specific beliefs as to particular miraculous accompaniments as going naturally with such a faith as this, and even found them for himself indispensable. But in the last resort, he was prepared to find that some 'do not recognize that,' and, in that case, would not exclude them from the pale of orthodoxy."

N. E. EGERTON SWANN.



## V

"I suggest the following as a 'minimum creed' to be offered to enquirers to-day. In the left-hand column A are the beliefs required, and in the right-hand B are interpretations, explanations or corollaries of the same. I do not like the words 'primary, secondary,' and have been criticized for using them, as though they meant 'essential, non-essential.' I should regard both A or B as essential, but in point of time A are primary and B secondary, and I should not press the acceptance of B until A had been grasped and accepted and the questions asked 'how?' and 'what then?' (This is the familiar distinction between fact and the interpretation of fact.)

"I believe—

## A

## B

In God as the personal originator and controller of the universe and the life-process.

As good and loving—*i.e.*, morally holy and actively benevolent.

In God as making Himself known in many ways, but most particularly in Jesus of Nazareth.

In Jesus as a revelation of both God and man; 'of what God is and what man ought to be.'

As Virgin-born and morally perfect.

In Jesus as overcoming evil.

As thus realizing in Himself the hopes and aspirations of Israel (and of humanity) and called the Christ.

In Jesus Christ as surviving death and passing to 'Heaven.'

*I.e.*, as passing to a higher spiritual state, and to full union with God.

In God as coming at Pentecost, and subsequently into the souls of men and women, as a Holy Spirit.

This Presence is Eternal Life.

In the Church as the organized fellowship of all who accept and practise these beliefs and the ideals taught by Jesus Christ.

Its authority is both divine and human, and membership involves the acceptance of the historic threefold ministry and the two Sacraments of Holy Baptism (of which Confirmation is the completion) and Holy Communion, as the means by which is conveyed to each member the assurance of God's love and forgiveness and the power to resist and overcome evil.

In man's survival of death, and in a future judgment.

This judgment is already being determined by the attitudes and actions of each individual. Its issue is Heaven or Hell—*i.e.*, union with or separation from God."

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.



## VI

The following pages were addressed to Canon Newell Long, and relate to the questions asked by Mr. Chitty. They are reproduced here by permission of the writer.

"The following represents what I should have written if your interlocutor's challenge had been addressed to me (after a momentary protest against his description of himself as 'one who believes that truth must always be valued above tradition,' a phrase which implies that 'truth' and 'tradition' are terms with mutually exclusive contents, and consequently begs the whole question in advance).

"I. *Emmet's Book (Conscience, Creeds, and Critics)*.—I am not aware that anyone has taken the trouble to controvert this work, as such:\* and the reason is that its main contentions, and the replies to them, are well known, its only distinctive feature being the extremely pleasant, modest and reasonable manner in which they are expressed. His argument may be summarized as follows:

"1. The scientific researcher, in whatever field, is bound to pursue a single-hearted quest for truth, and to follow the light of reason whithersoever it may lead him; it is, therefore, both useless and wrong for authority to attempt to dictate his conclusions, or to silence him by mere 'pronouncements' without argument; criticism which may seem to be destructive of cherished beliefs can only be met by criticism, not by denunciation or coercion.

"2. During the great readjustment of traditional theology to modern knowledge which began in the nineteenth century and is still going on, ecclesiastical authority, under the influence of blind panic, issued many condemnations which later reflection has shewn to be groundless, and asserted some positions (such as that of the literal inerrancy of Scripture in matters of scientific and historical fact) which have now been abandoned by all educated persons, and by authority itself.

"3. As 'authority' has such a bad record of indefensible condemnations, there is, accordingly, a very strong probability that any new condemnation that it may issue will eventually turn out to be equally groundless: it had, therefore, better keep silence when articles of the Creed are disparaged or denied on critical or philosophical grounds, and content itself with hoping for the best—that is, with hoping that, if the articles in question are really true, their truth will, in the long run, be vindicated by purely scientific methods.

"4. It follows that a clergyman of the Church of England who doubts or denies the Virginal Conception or the Empty Tomb ought to be left unmolested by authority, *so long as he holds fast to the central essence of the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Resurrection.*

"5. He ought also to be left unmolested by public opinion, in the sense that no imputation ought to be made upon his sincerity or honesty: for—

"(a) The gloss, if such it be, which he imposes upon the articles of the Creed affirming the Virginal Conception and Resurrection is no more arbitrary than that which all educated Churchmen now impose upon the articles affirming the *Descensus ad inferos* or the Ascension into heaven.

"(b) As the Anglican position, expressed in Article VIII., bases the

\* The Faith Press published in 1290 a Reply by Father Tremenheere, S.S.J.E., entitled *Critics, Creeds and Conscience* (Ed.).



Creeds upon 'most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,' it follows that the true sense of the Creeds is that which can be demonstrated from Scripture critically studied, and not necessarily that which follows from Scripture taken at its face value: and, as the Birth and Resurrection narratives, considered as history, are insufficiently attested, it follows that the Creeds should not be construed as insisting on the literal acceptance of the two wonders in question.

"The comments which would naturally be made, and have in fact often been made, by the defenders of orthodoxy upon these contentions may be summarized as follows:

"1. This paragraph, as it stands, will not be disputed by any reasonable person; its gist, in fact, was often maintained by so doughty a champion of the Catholic Faith as Bishop Gore—most strikingly, perhaps, in his famous paradox 'I could never endure to be otherwise than a freethinker' (*Philosophy of the Good Life*, p. 4). No one amongst ourselves denies that the student, *quâ* student, must be free to arrive at whatever conclusions his reason dictates. But this consideration, which in reference to the student *quâ* student is merely a truism, has no bearing on the question of the proper relation of a student who has by the free exercise of his reason become convinced of the truth of certain views to a society which exists for the purpose of propagating diametrically opposite views. The plain man would say that the obvious duty of such a one is to abstain from joining the society in question, or, if he is already a member of it, but has come to think that its characteristic tenets or some of them are mistaken, to leave it: and there is nothing in the principle of freedom of thought to shew that the plain man is wrong. A student of medicine is free to hold that vivisection is justifiable; but, holding this view, he is not morally free to apply for one of the Anti-Vivisection League's lectureships. An enormous amount of confusion has been caused by failure to distinguish between freedom to think as one likes, which is the birthright of all reasoning beings, and freedom to behave as one likes, which is not possessed or claimed by any moral being. And, if the individual is free to reject Christianity, the Christian Church in its turn must be free to reject him from membership or ministry, and its authorities are doing no more than their duty when they take steps to vindicate this principle.

"If, as is alleged under (2), the *de facto* authorities have in the past made many mistakes, and condemned what ought not to have been condemned, that is doubtless to be regretted; but the conclusion drawn in (3), that authority will always or usually be wrong in the future, does not in the least follow from it. There is a glaring logical *hiatus* between the propositions 'Some ecclesiastical authorities have been mistaken' and 'All ecclesiastical authorities are always mistaken.' On such methods of reasoning as this, the misdeeds of Judge Jeffreys in the past would necessitate the closing of the Old Bailey now. There is no authority on this planet, in Church or in State, which has not made many and grievous mistakes; if the memory of past mistake were allowed to paralyze present action, human society would come to an end. No doubt the depositaries of authority in the Church will be wisely guided if they avoid panic, if their doctrinal 'pronouncements' are as infrequent as possible and framed with the assistance of trained theologians, if they employ an infinite patience in dealing with those men of good will who do not contumaciously deny, but cannot *ex animo* accept this or that constituent of the majestic cycle of Catholic truth. But the mistakes of their pre-



decessors will not deter them from doing their duty, in accordance with the best light that they have.

"So much, indeed, is eventually conceded by Emmet; for he is too acute not to see that the argument from the admitted mistakes of some authorities to the necessary mistakenness of all authorities is anything but a satisfying induction *per enumerationem simplicem*, and too practical not to admit that there is no point in the existence of a Church which does not in the last resort stand for *something*. He allows that there was at least one case in which the judicial action of authority was not mistaken, the case of Voysey. But if the rulers of the Church are bound both to respect the liberty of scholars and to safeguard the reputation of its office-bearers for sincerity, where is the line to be drawn between tolerable and intolerable speculations? Emmet shall reply for himself: 'The dividing line clearly comes where re-statement and re-interpretation pass into definite denial of fundamental Christian beliefs' (*op. cit.*, p. 54). This sentence as it stands might have been written by Bishop Gore. There is, then, no real difference in principle between us and Emmet, even after his catalogue of the *gaffes* of nineteenth-century authorities; the question at issue reduces itself to one of fact—'What in fact are "fundamental Christian beliefs"?'"

"Emmet includes under this head the existence of God and the doctrines of the Incarnation or of 'the worship of Christ,' of the Atonement, of the Resurrection in the sense of the continued activity of the spirit of Jesus after death. (He does not mention the doctrine of the Trinity, but on the basis of my personal acquaintance with him I am sure that he was neither a Ditheist nor a Binitarian.) But he cannot see his way to include the Virginal Conception or the Empty Tomb in this category, for reasons which are summarized above under (4) and (5). Each of these reasons has been answered again and again. 'Descended' and 'ascended' no more imply that Hades is vertically beneath our feet or heaven above our heads than the allusion to God's 'right hand' implies that God possesses a vertebrate body; such phrases are easily understood to belong to the language of pictorial metaphor, which is indispensable in attempts to describe the suprasensible, and is readily distinguishable from the language of historical affirmation, such as is employed in the Birth and Resurrection clauses, which evidently purport to affirm literal events, occurring within the framework of space and time. Article VIII. gives a good reason, but not the only reason, why the Creeds should be 'thoroughly received and believed.' The Creeds are not 'based on' Scripture, but powerfully buttressed by it; they represent the corporate memory of the Church of God, a memory which might well have continued to exist and to inspire the evangelization of the world, even if it had never occurred to the Church to canonize the writings which we now call 'the New Testament.' The *objective* and *external* attestation of the Birth and Resurrection narratives is no better and no worse than that of any other parts of the Gospels; for a particular narrative or tradition may be much older than the document in which it is embedded, so that, *e.g.*, the relative lateness of 'Matthew' (which seems certain on grounds of internal criticism) does not *per se* prove that his Birth-tradition may not be coeval with or earlier than Mark or 'Q'; any proof of the late origin of this tradition must be based on considerations concerned with its intrinsic probability—that is, on what are in the last analysis subjective and *a priori* grounds.



"This is a point which is often overlooked. If it comes to the question of external attestation for a given incident in the Gospels, what attestation, what external guarantee have we that the Gospels as a whole, or even the Synoptic Gospels, really are what they are usually—even by radical critics—believed to be (that is, biographies written in good faith, not too long after the close of the life which they purport to narrate, by persons commanding access to reasonably reliable sources of information) and not second-century fictions? The date of a modern English book can be exactly controlled by the date of its registration at Stationers' Hall, and by a multitude of other purely objective contacts with contemporaneous events; but there is no record, official or unofficial, Christian, pagan or Jewish, of the composition or publication of the Gospels—it is not certain, indeed (as the Provost of Queen's has pointed out) whether we are justified in speaking of the 'publication,' in any formal sense, of documents which must have been secretly passed from hand to hand, in slums and garrets, by the adherents of a persecuted sect. The text of the Gospels contains no statements as to the names or identity of their compilers: and no MS. of any portion of their original Greek exists which can be dated earlier than the first half of the third century (the Chester Beatty papyri). No doubt it may be urged that the marvellously coherent and living picture of their Hero which they agree in presenting is beyond the powers of human imagination, that it must be the reflection of reality, and that this is the surest attestation of their general reliability. I heartily agree; but that is not an *objective* attestation; it belongs to the sphere of subjective impression, and has failed to convince the members of the 'Christ-myth' school, who are, I suppose, as intelligent as anyone else. The only objective attestation of the Gospels of which I know consists in sporadic citations of them by sub-apostolic writers, culminating in the emergence at the end of the second century of the canonical quaternion, without a rival, as the only biographies of her Master acknowledged by the Great, or 'Catholic' Church; and this attestation, so far as it goes, applies equally to all their parts. Given certain assumptions as to the existence of God, the likelihood of His having revealed Himself, and the general rationality of history, this is good enough for me; but it provides no criterion for distinguishing between 'well-attested' (in an objective sense) and 'weakly attested' sections of the evangelic record.

"It is not, therefore, unfair to say that the 'Liberal' critic does not reject the Virginal Conception because he has previously established on independent and objective grounds the lateness and secondary character of the sections which narrate it; on the contrary, he concludes that the narrative is late and secondary because he is already convinced on *a priori* grounds that such an event is impossible and therefore mythical. It is an *a priori Weltanschauung* which really settles the matter in his mind: if the Virginal Conception could, so to speak, 'start fair,' with no prejudice either for or against it, it would appear at least as likely to represent objective fact as the record of the narration by Jesus of the Parables of the Tares, the Hid Treasure, the Pearl of Great Price, and the Drag-net (for which 'Matthew' is our only authority).

"Ultimately, these questions are decided by the answer which is given to the question which lies behind them, 'What think ye of Christ?' If He was merely the greatest of the Hebrew prophets, and 'divine' only in an improper and metonymical sense, there is no reason for supposing that His entrance upon and departure from the stage of human life



were attended by any supernormal circumstances. If, on the other hand, He was eternal God—in all the crushingly stupendous and awe-inspiring meaning of the word 'God'—then, anything may have happened; and I see no reason for disbelieving the Catholic Church and the Gospels when they tell me that such and such events were what in fact did happen. This fundamental logic of the matter is becoming clearer every day in England (it has always been clear in Germany). Perhaps the most significant passage in Emmet's book is his appeal to Professor Kirsopp Lake's treatment of the Resurrection as evidence that a critic who rejects the Empty Tomb may none the less hold fast to the belief in the continued presence and activity of our Lord in His Church. It is significant in a sense which its author could not have foreseen; for, read in the light of Dr. Lake's last book (*Paul: His Heritage and Legacy*, 1934), which expressly disclaims belief in 'the deity of Jesus,' and affirms inability to assign any content to the term 'God' which goes beyond the idea of the 'totality of values,' it shews vividly how much water has flowed under the bridges since it was written.

"II. *Dr. Tennant on the 'Evidential Value of Miracle.'*—Mr. Chitty appears to be under the impression that there is something desperately unorthodox about the sentence which he quoted from Dr. Tennant, to the effect that that 'alleged miracle is devoid of all evidential value.' In fact, however, this is merely a commonplace of modern apologetic method; we cannot employ the Virginal Conception as *evidence* for the Godhead of Jesus, for the simple reason that belief in the Virginal Conception *presupposes* belief in the Godhead of Jesus. It is the precise point on which I have endeavoured to insist above, in the concluding paragraphs of my comments on Emmet. I do not think that Mr. Chitty need be under any apprehensions of any attack on Dr. Tennant's ecclesiastical status being founded on this sentence or upon the profound and subtle treatise (*Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*) in which it occurs.

"III. I am afraid that I fail to see the exact point of the two questions which he puts to you in his third paragraph. I do not profess to be able to distinguish perfectly or exhaustively between the activities or experiences which are severally proper to each of our Lord's Two Natures. It seems to me that growth, nutrition, fatigue, sleep, death, and emotions such as surprise and anger are not predicable of Deity as such, but are affections of Humanity—though, as He who in His Manhood experienced them was also personally God, I see no objection to the modes of speech indicated by the term *communicatio idiomatum*. I do not think that orthodoxy binds us to the exact distinction drawn by St. Leo in the famous phrase 'Unum horum' (sc. 'Verbum' and 'caro') 'coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit iniuriis.' But such questions must always be matters for speculation. A literal answer to his second question would, I suppose, be 'Yes': but what does this prove?"

N. P. WILLIAMS.

### THE PROEM OF THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

THE following version of the first three chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians is meant to be a translation of that vital fragment of St. Paul's writings into current terms. It is, consequently, not a verbal translation; it is an endeavour to find the most adequate phrase for each fact and idea



brought forward by St. Paul. In some cases, we are in the habit of looking at the same fact, or contemplating the same idea, from another angle. It is therefore easier, and perhaps safer for us, in our endeavour to perceive what he is trying to indicate, if we use terms with which we are familiar. To do so, of course, sometimes involves using phrases with a smaller content than those of St. Paul. But after all, if, by these means, we can identify the spiritual experiences to which he is pointing us, we can go back to the larger phrase afterwards, and learn to take a more comprehensive view.

With regard to the contents, it is to be observed that it is probable that this letter was meant to be read to the members of the Church in Laodicea. These, as we know, were only lukewarm Christians. Startling as St. Paul's estimate of the potentialities of Christians may be, it is doubly startling to those of us who, like the Laodiceans, are inclined to regard tepidity as our natural state. For it is just such people whom St. Paul is violently awakening to an appreciation of their endowments and their God.

## CHAPTER I.

## = VERSE:

- 1 I, Paul, who act as Christ's representative, only because God  
decided that I should, (send this letter) to the people who are conse-
- 2 crated\* by Christ Jesus and faithful to Him. May God the Father  
and the Divine Lord Jesus give you beauty of character and serenity  
of mind.
- 3 How worthy of blessing is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus  
Christ, (the Father) Who has blessed us with all kinds of spiritual  
blessing in those noble moods in which we are alive to the spiritual
- 4 world! This blessing follows on His having marked us out before
- 5 the birth of the Universe, to be part of Christ's organism. Out of
- 6 sheer kindness, and simply because He willed it, God put us into the  
class of people related to Him as sons, through Jesus Christ, for the  
display of the magnificence of the endowment with which He has
- 7 endowed us in the Beloved. In Christ, the Beloved, we have, by  
means of the current of His life, liberation, *i.e.*, release from bad habits,
- 8 (a release which is) given to us with all the profusion of His generosity  
and unrestrictedly conveyed to us by (conferring on us) spiritual
- 9 knowledge and practical wisdom. (In order to help us) the Father
- 10 gave us the clue to the intention on which He had settled. This, He  
had arranged, was to take effect in Christ, when the due combination  
of circumstances was brought about. The intention was to bring all  
things to a head in Christ, in both the spiritual and political worlds.
- 11 (They were to be brought to a head) in Him, in Whom we were given  
an allotted portion, we being appointed thereto under the scheme  
contemplated by Him, Who impels all things along the lines which He
- 12 has determined, to the end that we, who put our hope in Christ, should  
reflect credit on His magnificence.
- 13 In that "we," you are included. You heard the statement of  
the truth, the good news that real well-being was to be yours. And  
when you came to believe it, you had the King's mark put on you by
- 14 the promised Divine Spirit, Who comes to you as the first instalment of

\* Omitting, for the sake of clearness, "who are in such and such a place."



## VERSE.

your allotted portion, towards the full purchase of your holding—  
another cause for praising the munificence of God.

- 15 For this reason, I, myself, having heard about your reliance on  
our Divine King, Jesus, and your friendliness to all God's people,  
16 constantly make thanksgiving for you, thus remembering you in my  
17 prayers (with the hope) that the God of our Leader, Jesus Christ, the  
Ardent Father, may give you an instinct for valuing and grasping the  
18 facts which are disclosed to you as you come to know Him, your  
mental outlook being enlightened to such a degree that you may  
19 recognize both the prospect arising out of your being selected and  
also the richness of the splendid endowment (which He gives) in the  
community of His People and the abounding magnitude of the power,  
20 which He exerts on us, in the exercise of the force of His energy. (You  
can gauge the extent of this energy, when you consider that it is the  
21 same energy) which He exerted on Christ, when He raised Him from  
the zero of life, and set Him at the peak of power, above every other  
centre of force, whether in the present system or any other system  
22 which is to supervene. He has put Him in the dominating position,  
and has given Him to be the controlling brain to that assemblage  
(of living units) which forms a body for Him, and is the full expression  
of Him Who is expressing Himself as the total reality of each and all.

## CHAPTER II.

- 1 (Consider the effectiveness which His energy has shewn in you).  
2 Your real selves had been deprived of conscious life by the blunders  
and errors, which you committed because you went by the conventions  
3 of the times, at the bidding of forces of the lower sort, the motives  
which are at work in refractory minds. As a matter of fact, the move-  
ments of every one of us were dictated by the desires of the senses,  
so that we followed the inclination of our material nature, which carried  
the brain along with it—and we were angry people like the rest.  
4 But God, being rich in pity, through the great love with which He  
loved us, even when we were utterly unresponsive, being numbed by  
5 our sins, awoke us to consciousness along with Christ—you were  
6 rescued by act of grace—and raised us along with Him and settled  
7 us on that spiritual level which is in Christ Jesus, in order that He  
might thus shew, in the resulting spiritual conditions, the overflowing  
richness of His gracious gift, in His kindness towards us in Christ  
Jesus.  
8 You were rescued by a pure act of grace by means of faith: and  
9 even this latter does not originate in yourselves, it is given you by  
God. It is not of our own creation, and therefore no one may pride  
10 himself on it. For we are His product, created by (or in) Christ for  
useful purposes, which God has planned out beforehand for us to be  
occupied in.  
11 Therefore consider the fact that at one time you were foreign (to  
the Kingdom) to all appearance, being called irreligious by those who  
12 had the external marks of religion. At that time you stood apart  
from Christ, being external to the constitution of the Kingdom and  
having no status under the undertakings and assurances on which the



VERSE

Kingdom was modelled. You had nothing to look forward to, and were living in a world without a God.

13 But now, in Christ Jesus, you, who were extraneous, have been made integral by the vitality of Christ. For He is our harmonizing  
14 principle, since He unifies opposites, dissolving in His organism the  
15 barriers of separation, the antagonism, the sharp line drawn by the old regulations, so that He might make the opposing factions into a  
16 single new Humanity in Himself, thus creating a concord. He adjusted the two sets of people to God in one organism, through the Cross,  
17 having slain by it the enmity which it expressed. He came (on the scene) displaying the possibility of peace to you who were distant and  
18 to those who were near. For through Him both of us attain to contact, in one Spirit, to the Father.

19 So then, you are no longer strangers and visitors, but fellow-citizens  
20 with God's people and members of God's household. You are made into a house, whose substructure consists of the apostles and prophets,\* the corner-stone (crowning and uniting the walls) being Christ Himself, in Whom the whole building is harmonized and (so) grows into a divine Sanctuary in the Lord, in Whom you also are being made into a structure to form a dwelling-place of God in the Spirit.

## CHAPTER III.

1 For this cause, I, Paul, who have been imprisoned for you out-  
2 siders—I suppose you have heard about the commission to administer  
3 the bounty of God, which I have to discharge towards you. The  
4 fundamental principle of His policy has been disclosed to me, as I have already stated in brief in order that by reading (what I have  
5 written) you may follow up my analysis of God's intention which  
6 underlay the sending of the Christ.† This was not made known to the human race, in other days, in anything like the way in which it is  
7 now made intuitively known to His divinely moved messengers and spokesmen. (This ulterior purpose is) that all kinds of people should  
8 be co-partners, organic members and shareholders in what is promised in Christ Jesus in the splendid programme which I have to help to carry out, acting by means of the gift of the energy imparted to me by God on the full scale of His dynamic force.

9 To me, the most insignificant of God's people, is given the privilege of publishing to the world at large the incalculable resources of Christ,  
10 and of casting light on the question, What is the social structure arising out of the purpose which has been made implicit (in creation) from the beginning by God, Who made all things, in order that, at this point, might be made evident to those who are pre-eminent in the spiritual world, through this assemblage of human units, the many-sided constructive ability of God, shewing itself in the purpose running

\* This mention of apostles and prophets is in line with the general run of St. Paul's thought in this passage. There are various pairs of types which need union, but are apt to recoil from one another, e.g. institutionalists and mystics, socialists and individualists. St. Paul is, in himself, a capital example of the combination of each of these two pairs. It is necessary that such complementary types should be adjusted to one another, in Christ and by Christ.

† The Messiah.



## VERSE

11 through the ages, which God brought to pass in Christ Jesus, our Divine Master, in Whom we have free self-expression and also an efficient connection\* with God by means of faith in Him.

13 I therefore beg you not to lose heart over my troubles about you—  
14 they only shew how important your cause is. (Indeed,) on account of  
15 this movement, I entreat the Father, by Whom every organism, in the spiritual world and on earth, is given its significance, that, in His  
16 splendid way, He will grant you to be charged with power, in your  
17 higher selves, through the impulse which He gives, and that Christ may  
18 inhabit your minds through your willingness to give Him an opportunity, so that you may be rooted in love and founded on it, and,  
19 as the result, may be capable of apprehending,† through conjunction with all God's people, the new Universe in all its vastness, and also of ascertaining that love of Christ which surpasses knowledge.

20 To the ultimate source of all activity, Who is able to act on a scale exceeding our desires and our dreams, by virtue of the force which He has set at work in us, to Him belongs the splendour which pervades the community of the redeemed, and shines out in Christ, through every succession of events, through the uttermost levels of life.

R. O. P. TAYLOR.

### NOTES ON PERIODICALS

IN the July issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* Father Galtier investigates the history of early penitence, and he thinks that "l'histoire de la pénitence aux premiers siècles est une vaste mer. On y observe beaucoup de courants." Nevertheless, he tries to plumb their depths and to ascertain their diverse directions. There is an elaborate account of the methods pursued in general and the attitude to them of St. Gregory, Tertullian, St. Augustine, and the Irish monks in Spain. Father Gougau publishes the hitherto unpublished journal of François Rio, who acutely observed London society in 1839. Father Mollay examines the beginning of the French occupation at Rome in 1849, and he too uses unpublished sources. Nothing was so momentous to Napoleon III. as this occupation, the prime cause of all his misfortunes. Thanks to this occupation he had no allies when the Germans attacked him; thanks to the Franco-German War Europe exchanged a mistress for a master and that master Bismarck; thanks to the supremacy of Germany for the next forty years there was a World War whose consequences will last for generations; and it mainly began with Napoleon III.'s ill-considered occupation of Rome, which also rendered the publication of the infallibility of the Pope a certainty.

C. P. S. C.

\* This phrase, used commonly in speaking of electricity, seems to convey St. Paul's intention. But it is possible, on the strength of a translation mentioned in the Vocabulary, that "foothold" may be nearer the mark.

† This is based on the analogy of the body. As, for example, the eye is aided by the senses of smell and hearing, as well as by the senses of touch and of muscular extension, in appreciating a beautiful landscape, so, to each soul in Christ, come the appreciative emotions of all the souls who perceive God, to confirm and define its own partial impression.



## REVIEWS

AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING. By Dr. John Baillie. London: Oxford University Press. 1934. Pp. xiv+294. 10s. 6d. net.

This is a truly remarkable and valuable book, and one which will fulfil a long felt need. It was written, as the author tells us, because of his conviction that a large part of the "current discussion of the problem of eternal life proceeds on entirely wrong lines" (p. vii). This he considers applies not only to the more popular treatment of the subject, but also to the contributions which are continually being made to it by contemporary philosophers. He is certainly right when he states the necessity of considering not only the nature of the desire for eternal life, and the possibility of its attainment, but also the nature of this eternal life toward which desire has been directed. It is this which he considers "has been fundamentally misrepresented."

It is difficult in a short space to give anything like an adequate idea of this very satisfying and thorough piece of work. The author is singularly well equipped for his difficult and exacting task, which is, in fact, to provide the modern thinking and educated man with adequate reasons for dissatisfaction with that position which is now so common—viz., that the idea of eternal life has lost its interest and significance. This outlook he traces historically to the Renaissance, and to the reaction from that "otherworldliness" which characterized the religion of the Middle Ages. In dealing with this aspect of his subject he is scrupulously fair, and does the fullest justice to what he rightly recognizes to be the difficulties of the modern man. In his chapter on "The Proper Claims of Earth" he carefully evaluates the contribution made by Humanism to the development of religious and ethical thought; and here, as elsewhere, his conclusions are helpful and enlightening. In the following chapter, "The Approach to the Eternal Prospect," he points out that our proper concern for immortality rightly proceeds, not from personal, but impersonal motives. We may possibly be indifferent as to our own prospects of survival, but we cannot be indifferent to that of those whom we love and revere. "The man who can see his beloved die, believing that it is for ever, and say 'I don't care' is a traitor to his beloved and to all that their love has brought them. He has no right not to care" (p. 53). From this the author passes to the consideration of the "Christian assurance of immortality." This assurance was attained by the early Christians, "not by the contemplation of their own



souls, nor by the thought of their own death, but by the contemplation of Another who had died before their eyes, that Other whom they most loved and found most precious, even Jesus Christ." "If their relationship to Jesus had been thought of by them as a merely human bond, their hope of continued life with Him must have always remained at the level of mere desire. It was only because they found in this relationship a deeper and diviner meaning that their hope passed into triumphant and assured conviction" (pp. 58-9).

Chapters IV. and V. are of especial value and interest. They contain a lucid and succinct account of the history of the idea of immortality from the earliest times. The author is thoroughly at home in the large and technical literature of this part of his subject. He quotes freely from a considerable range of writers dealing with the hope of immortality in Israel, Greece, India, and Persia. He shews how the idea of survival, common to primitive races, is rather a quasi-scientific than a genuinely religious conception. He traces the activity of the Hebrew prophets in their attempts to overthrow crude and unethical conceptions, and shews the manner in which they prepared the way for the higher ideas which had already begun to make their appearance in pre-Christian times, and which are based on a fuller appreciation of the value and permanence of the individual. He deals very fully with the Greek contribution to the subject, shewing an intimate acquaintance with recent literature and doing full justice to the work of such scholars as Burnet and A. E. Taylor. He compares the value of the purely philosophical ideas of Plato, which so greatly influenced subsequent thought, with the ideas derived from "the mysteries" by which Plato himself was so greatly influenced, and he treats with real knowledge and insight the place of the "myth" in the Platonic writings.

But perhaps the most valuable section of the whole book, which indeed does not contain a dull or superfluous page, is the chapter entitled "The Nature of Eternal Life." It occupies little more than fifty pages, yet in spite of the great difficulty of the subject it is written with singular lucidity. Throughout the book we are conscious of the influence of von Hügel, who is very frequently quoted, but his influence is naturally more apparent in this chapter than in any other part of the book. Yet we cannot fail to observe the difference between Dr. Baillie's style and that of the writer of *Eternal Life*, a book so difficult that many must have despaired of comprehending even a part of what it has to teach. Dr. Baillie is no mere imitator or compiler, he is an original and constructive thinker, yet it would not be too much to say that he has translated into intelligible and



attractive form the main theses of von Hügel's great essay. More than this, he has the spirit of this great philosopher, that free and untrammelled outlook so remote from the point of view of the conventional apologist, or the purely impersonal attitude of the professional historian or philosopher. It is impossible to do justice to this section of the book by quoting a sentence here, and there; it fittingly concludes with the familiar words of 1 John iii. 2, 3, on which it is a commentary of the highest value both theologically and philosophically. It abounds in valuable quotations, and we meet not only the famous definitions of Eternity of Boethius and St. Augustine, but the idea is traced in the writings of mediæval and modern philosophers and theologians, till we come to such writers of our own time as Streeter, Karl Adam, and many others. A truly remarkable chapter and to be studied with real profit.

The volume concludes with a chapter entitled "Strangers and Pilgrims," summarizing the position reached by the author in the course of his study. Dr. Baillie has been careful throughout to do full justice to the two tendencies of thought which may be called respectively "otherworldliness" and "hitherworldliness;" he points out what is of permanent value in each of these conceptions, and the necessity of keeping them properly balanced. It is the necessary and inevitable tension between these two tendencies which, when rightly balanced, will produce an outlook which contains within itself all that is most essential to a truly spiritual and genuinely ethical outlook on life.

In a work of this character no critic will agree in detail with all that is said, but it is seldom that one encounters a book for which one can be so genuinely grateful to the writer. Detailed criticism is impossible in the space at our disposal, but one or two points may be mentioned. It is no doubt true that what Dr. Baillie calls the familiar "trptych of Hell, Purgatory, and Heaven" has lost its ancient impressiveness for the modern man. Dr. Baillie has done not a little to help towards a comprehension of the Christian conception of Heaven, and his work is equally useful in dispelling many of the very unchristian ideas of Hell which popular imagination has foisted on to semi-official statements of Christian doctrine. But it may be doubted whether he has done justice to the conception of Purgatory in its more refined and philosophical presentation. Also in his valuable historical sketch he might have said something of the influence of Islamic thought on mediæval eschatology, a subject which is of some interest and importance in view of the researches of such scholars as Fr. Miguel Asin, and which does a good deal to explain the reaction of the scholars of the Renaissance.

Dr. Baillie is leaving America, where he has held the chair of



Systematic Theology in the Union Seminary, New York, and is about to take up his duties as Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Theologians in Great Britain will welcome this appointment. It is not usual to find a scholar who is at once so accomplished and, if we may say so, so human and warm-hearted as the author of *The Life Everlasting*. He seems equally at home in the departments of theology, philosophy, history, and archæology. But in addition to all this he is most widely read not only in ancient and classical literature, but also in modern poetry and fiction in many tongues, and he further displays an intimate acquaintance and appreciation of painting and music. It is a long step from Plato to the modern pessimistic philosopher of Spain, Miguel de Unamuno, but Dr. Baillie knows and appreciates both, and gives his readers the benefit of his scholarship in a singularly attractive and un-oppressive way.

Yet there is something more than all this which really constitutes both the chief value and attraction of this remarkable book. It is the fact, which we are never quite allowed to forget, that the author is a minister of Christ, who has, like von Hügel, tested his own religious experience in many ways and not least by comparing and contrasting it with that of others. For it is obviously his great concern to lead others to those spiritual pastures where he has clearly found his own solace and delight.

H. LEONARD PASS.

---

A NEW ARGUMENT FOR GOD AND SURVIVAL AND A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF SUPERNATURAL EVENTS. By Malcolm Grant. Faber and Faber. 12s. 6d.

Not infrequently, the requirements of its elaborate "architectonic" led the author of the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* into wrong paths; but on one occasion at least they may be said to have guided him to what was in essence the right conclusion. "There are three, and only three, speculative proofs by which it is possible to attempt to deduce the existence of a Supreme Being." The divorce here implied between the "speculative" and the "practical" approach to Theism is perhaps a little awkward; for it is difficult to see how there can be any "proof" of the existence of God which is not in some sense speculative. Yet Kant rightly recognized that all known *Gottesbeweise* which were "speculative" in a more restricted sense fell into three groups, and his belief that in principle no speculative proof of a new type beyond these three would be discovered in the



future has so far been vindicated. At any rate, had Kant been confronted with Mr. Grant's "new arguments" for the facts of God and of Survival—the fact of Freedom (Kant's third idea) is perhaps too self-evident to Mr. Grant to require any defence—he would have denied its originality and maintained that Mr. Grant had reformulated the Cosmological Argument.

In essence, the Cosmological Argument sets out from either a selection or the totality of empirical facts. The newness and impressiveness of Mr. Grant's defence is the set of facts from which he begins. Instead of Motion (the traditional starting-point), Mr. Grant makes Miracles his basis. And by "Miracles" he understands not the Gospel miracles (upon which the Paleyan argument rested), but the "miracles" of today. In this category he includes the whole range of phenomena which may be subsumed under the name of the Occult—ghosts, faith-healing, the data of psychical research, thought-reading, and so forth. Many of these phenomena—notably those associated with spiritualism—have long been used as an argument for Immortality, and Mr. Grant also himself employs them for that purpose. But the primary use which he makes of them is as evidence for Theism.

Compared with the advocates of the traditional form of the Cosmological Argument, Mr. Grant is at a disadvantage in that he is unable to assume that his basic facts will be allowed. However ingenious and subtle were the criticisms with which St. Thomas had to deal—and they were many—the Angelic Doctor never discovered an antagonist (either in his imagination or in the flesh) who denied the existence of motion, presumably. Mr. Grant, however, finds it necessary to establish first of all the phenomena upon which the argument is to rest. Roughly half the volume is concerned with this establishment of fact. In our judgment, this is done admirably. The evidence is arranged in an orderly fashion, and nowhere is it strained; and the chapters in which it is presented (sandwiched, as it were, in a number of layers between the rest) allow a pleasant relaxation from the closeness of attention required in the more systematic chapters of the book. Any who are sceptical about twentieth-century "miracles" (in Mr. Grant's sense) should certainly read this book. We believe that they will be converted.

Some of Mr. Grant's more philosophized contentions, however, seem to us less convincing. With his main argument we are indeed wholeheartedly in agreement, provided he would not tie us down to his repeated assertion that it is *new*. The Conditioned must always find its final explanation in the Unconditioned. This is surely the root conviction of Theism. But on some matters of detail Mr. Grant's views seem open to



criticism. For a genuinely Theistic philosophy, the very sharp cleavage which the author draws between the Miraculous and the Scientific raises difficulties of a serious kind. If both "Miracles" and "Nature" have a common Source, it is hardly credible that the Miraculous should be completely beyond the range of Law, whereas the non-miraculous should be just as completely dominated by it. Nature passes into Miracle by a series of stages, differing only in degree. And, further, the very fact that the categorical structure of the Miraculous is less adequately understood than that of the Natural renders Miracle a less adequate and not a more adequate basis upon which to build up the Theistic case. It is worth remembering that there have been those who have sought the *fons et origo* of certain spiritualistic phenomena not in God, but in the Devil. Mr. Grant endeavours to counter such conclusions by attempting to prove that there can be only one ground of reality, but hardly at the length which the objection merits.

There is some discussion of Hume in the book, whom we are inclined to think Mr. Grant takes too seriously. The Essay on Miracles, which constitutes the tenth section of Hume's *Enquiry on the Human Understanding*, is admittedly famous, and Hume, indeed, intended it to be. Hume did not mean the *Enquiry* to miss the public eye, as the *Treatise* had done some twenty years earlier; and a few rather shocking remarks on Miracles were thought likely to make for notoriety. Herein is to be found the sole ground why Hume wrote the Essay. In point of fact, the philosophy underlying it is incompatible with the rest of Hume's contentions. If Hume had successfully discredited, as he claimed to have done, the law of Causality, then it was meaningless to pour scorn on the Miraculous. In a world in which causality did not reign every event would be of the nature of a miracle.\*

F. L. CROSS.

HISTORICAL RECORDS OF THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF SOUTH AFRICA. By Cecil Lewis and G. E. Edwards. S.P.C.K. Pp. 821. 25s.

In this magnificent volume of over 800 pages S.P.C.K. has shewn to the full its powers of first-rate production. The printing and general display are admirable.

"Our first idea was to write a history as a manual for students," so the authors explain; and such was probably in the mind of the South African bishops when they formally

\* I am delighted to find confirmation of the view of Hume taken in this paragraph in Professor A. E. Taylor's valuable *Philosophical Studies*, which have come to my notice since the above words were written.—F. L. C.



requested these ladies to undertake the task. Miss Lewis was already known for excellent historical work, and in Miss Edwards she secured a most capable colleague. The formal commission gives to the "Historical Records" something of official character, and the bishops may be well pleased that the modest project has grown to this result.

Readers will believe the Archbishop of Capetown when, in his introductory letter, he assures us that for six years the authors have been devoting "unremitting care and energy to the collecting of information." For the literature is immense, and the industry in research, here manifest, has been amazing. That will be the lasting value of the book. "Lives," full and many, there are of Bishops Gray, Colenso, Key, Dean Green, and others; histories such as those of Theal and Professor Walker; travel books and studies of the land and its many peoples; reprints of the Van Riebeck Society. All these have been consulted, but, alas! not the splendid collection of Mr. J. G. Gubbins, a keen churchman, for that was destroyed by fire along with the library of the Witwatersrand University, to which he had just presented it. Besides, we have here gathered the more intimate news, buried in letters, reports of missionary societies, diocesan magazines, and the like, which is scarcely accessible to the ordinary reader. The whole is fully documented.

If the writers be reproached as having assembled too much and too particular material, their answer can be twofold. First, that the critic errs in not having observed that these are "Records" and not a history. What they have been doing is to put together matter for which, with all the references, the future historian will bless them day and night for having spared him immensely in his quest. Secondly, that, besides the claims of historic truth, there is such a thing as personal and homely interest. This Church is very young, and many of the pioneers and founders, or their close descendants, are living still. The latter, especially, will be grateful that the memory of the first doers and doings should be written down, for such memory quickly fades.

The "Records" appear opportunely. For three dissident parishes are carrying on strongly subsidized propaganda to persuade our churchpeople in South Africa that the Church of the Province is a "different religious association from the Church of England." In reply the "Provincial Literature Committee" point out that the Church of the Province, as a voluntary religious association, is entirely on the same footing as, for instance, the disestablished Churches of Ireland or of Wales, which are in full and unquestioned communion and



fellowship with the Church of England. Though no legal bond exists, the ever-repeated invitation to the South African bishops, with all other Anglican bishops, to the Lambeth Conference, and the translation, without dispute, of South African bishops to episcopal status in the Homeland, should be enough to convince these three parishes that they have the whole Anglican Communion against them. And if our "Third Proviso" be objected, the Committee can quote an exact equivalent in the constitution of the Church in Wales: "The courts of the Church in Wales shall not be bound by any decision of the English courts, or of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in relation to matters of Faith, Discipline, and Ceremonial."

Our much-harried fellow-churchmen in South Africa, then, will be comforted by these timely and careful "Records" of the stormy waters through which their Church passed to spiritual emancipation from legal fetters.

They will learn also how fully, if on this score alone, has been justified Bishop Gray's carefulness to associate the laity with the bishops and clergy in the government of the Church. For thrice over anxiety concerning property has led to attempts to repeal that "Third Proviso"; and each time the attempt has been defeated by the vote of the House of Laymen, without need to invoke the clergy and the bishops. In this connexion the authors could have referred to Bishop Moberly's Bampton Lectures on the *Administration of the Holy Spirit*. In the fourth lecture he deploras "the heavy loss" and "terrible evil" resulting from the exclusion of the lay-people from "the direct participation in the consultations of the Church." The lectures were delivered in 1868, and doubtless encouraged Bishop Gray in his proceeding, for his first Provincial Synod was held in 1870.

The laymen in Synod have also resisted change in the marriage laws, but, at the same time, have proved themselves progressive. The "Records" give a useful account of the new South African Liturgy. Some conservatives sought to provoke lay opposition, but the laymen voted for it by large majorities in two successive Provincial Synods.

For constitutional history, therefore, and at the present juncture, these "Records" will be welcomed, and they carry us right up to the present. But one of the most instructive sections is the first, "The Site of the Building," 1749-1848. For such books as Dr. J. H. Hewitt's "Sketches" of the early days are out of print; and the story illustrates vividly what happens to an Episcopal Church when left without episcopate. And that is apathy and chaos.

When the English had been in occupation for eight years,



at last, in 1814, they bethought them to build the first of our churches in South Africa. This was at Simonstown, the naval station. Before long it tumbled down, an occurrence which so disheartened the authorities that they did not try again for twenty years, but hired a share in a Wesleyan meeting-house. We had no church in Capetown, but were kindly allowed by the Dutch Reformed to say matins on Sunday in their "Groot Kerk." When in 1820 the S.P.G., which had nobly succoured our Church in South Africa, offered £500 towards the building of a church, the Ordinary, who was the Governor, replied that "such a building was not wanted there." When in 1834 a church was actually built, it was by a joint-stock company, whose 6 per cent. dividends were secured on pew-rents. The most popular preacher was a certain O'Halloran, whose eloquence attracted crowds; but after a time he was discovered to be an imposter, and not in Holy Orders at all—to the consternation of the couples he had married. No wonder Bishop Wilson, who, on his way to India, landed and confirmed 240 persons, and also held the first ordination, wrote: "The Church in this colony wants a head. Everyone does what is right in his own eyes."

The "Records" are leading up from this sorry tale to the consecration of Robert Gray in 1847. It is fair to say there had been some worthy priests during this period, notably Rev. W. Wright, accounted by the authors "the first of the great men who have deserved well of the country" and have been ill repaid—an allusion this to the saying, "South Africa, the grave of great reputations." But the odds were heavy against them, and the revival of church life had not yet travelled those six thousand miles.

Revival, and that remarkable, was to come with the first bishop. The authors are wonderfully self-restrained. They tell of brave deeds. Robertson bearding the fierce Zulu King, and the like, with scarce a word of comment; the facts in the Colenso struggle, which excited the whole English-speaking world, are given, and the reader is left to judge; certain unhappy things, known to South Africans, are not shirked, but treated with wise reserve. On one theme they do let go, and that theme is Bishop Gray; and most of those who here learn what he was and did will be indulgent. If he did not unite in himself quite all the excellencies of an Athanasius, an Aquinas, and a Francis of Assisi (p. 27), it may be that he was granted, like Elisha, the portion of a first-born. Just to take the first comparison, it was John Keble who read Gray's charge, delivered in Natal after Colenso's deposition, and said: "It looks to me like a fragment from the fourth century, recovered for use in



the nineteenth." And the veteran Duff of India wrote of the same charge: "It was worthy of any of the Fathers of the ancient, of any of the Reformers of modern times." Saint Athanasius, again, surely had stony paths to tread in Egyptian deserts. But those who know South African mountains and roads and drifts even today, and think of the unbridged rivers, the awful tracks, the wild tribes of eighty years ago, with not a yard of railway, will marvel at Gray's treks of 3,000 miles, of 4,000 miles, in cart, on horseback, or for days on foot. He arrived to find fourteen clergy in the land, half a dozen churches hundreds of miles apart, scattered and dispirited groups of churchfolk, and, with eight or nine other bodies at work among the heathen, no missionary effort whatever. After twenty-five strenuous years he left an organized province containing six established dioceses, and a wholly different spirit of hope and enterprise in the clergy and our people. Bishop Gray is no doubt the centre of this book, and something of the inspiration of its authors.

It is as well that the Colenso case should be given at length. For we meet people today who suppose that Colenso was only a proto-martyr in the cause of Old Testament criticism. The offence lay far deeper. Of course, what seized public attention was his attack on the Pentateuch; but forty-one British bishops wrote to him advising him to resign his position, "when you can no longer discharge its duties, or use the formularies to which you have subscribed." For in his Commentary on the Romans Colenso had written: "There is not a single passage in the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology that our Lord died for our sins"; and, again: "We have already died unto sin, and risen again unto righteousness at our very birth-hour." And he had not hesitated to draw the practical conclusions (p. 167).

A great part of the book is devoted to records of the several dioceses. This was almost inevitable, for each diocese marks a stage in the Church's advance; and the areas are so huge, the circumstances so different, that it is convenient to treat them separately. For example, Zululand, a purely missionary diocese, is much unlike those which have a large European population, though, in its tale of constant war, it is true to type with South Africa in general. The Cape alone reckons eight Kafir wars, and there have been others better known. Perhaps nowhere else in the world has a branch of our Church, from the first days till almost the last, been so continuously wrapped around with war. This, too, the readers of the book will learn.

To finish, a gentle growl. Why call the mixed race "Euro-african"? That stately appellation is not used in South Africa;



certainly not by those most concerned. They call themselves "de kleurde" (coloured), "kleurde," or "de bruin meuse." "Native" (the natives greatly dislike "Kafir"), "coloured," "white," or "European," and "Indian" are the common terms in English. "Eurasian" is no doubt the model copied. But however true the one style may be in India, the other, in South Africa, is only partially correct. Of the half-million "coloured" a clear majority have nothing in them of European, but are either pure descendants of Asiatics brought from Dutch possessions in the slave days of long ago or are mixed by union with Hottentots or other native tribes.

J. O. NASH, C.R.,  
*Lately Coadjutor Bishop of Capetown.*

---

## NOTICES

CONSCIENCE: ITS NATURE AND AUTHORITY. By Archibald Chisholm, D.Litt. Nisbet. 3s. 6d.

This is a short but vigorous defence of traditional Christian ethics by a mind that has well sifted the revolutionary elements in the thought of today. It claims a foundation in the Gestalt psychology; the *whole* ego, however made up, aims at harmonious integration. It is definitely intuitional; following Dr. Hartmann, it says: "The consciousness of what is worthy of imitation is nothing except a form of the *a prioristic* consciousness of value." Value comprehends the three standards, Truth, Goodness, and Beauty; and our intuitive sense cannot be deflected by argument, and "cannot but acknowledge that in Jesus these ideals find their only adequate representation." Mr. C. E. M. Joad is quoted as an exponent of intuitional ethics.

Dr. Chisholm discusses most sanely variable interpretations of the inner voice on such issues as war, difficulties in business life, and other pressing problems. He gives a workable scheme of the art of life, if you accept his premisses, based on the "common sense" of the ordinary man, which of course is very open to criticism from the point of view of authority. His discussion of the limits of compromise should be useful.

W. J. FERRAR.

---

DEATH IN THE VALLEY. By Bernard Newman. Denis Archer. 7s. 6d.

Visitors to Oberammergau can well beguile the journey with this stirring story of how death after his long march from the East pierced the cordon that defended the Ammer valley. Love was of course his tool, and the love that broke through is very pathetically and frankly told. The characteristic of the lovers is all so good, and the local detail so true, that it seems a pity that Mr. Mountain gave so much space to the imaginative journey of the plague from Asia.

W. J. FERRAR.



THE CHURCH OF ISRAEL: STUDIES AND ESSAYS. By the late Robert Hatch Kennett. Edited with an Introduction by S. A. Cook. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

This book contains a long review of Dr. Kennett's work by Dr. S. A. Cook, a select list of his writings, several reprints, and a number of studies put together from Dr. Kennett's writings by Dr. Cook. The result is a volume giving a clear picture of some of Kennett's far-reaching theories. His theory of the origin of the Pentateuchal documents differs considerably from the commonly accepted theory. The Decalogue in its *original* form he assigns to the time of Jehu; E was drawn up after the Fall of Samaria for the instruction of the mixed multitude brought in by the Assyrians; J was a counter-blast to Josiah's reformation by a reactionary party anxious that animal sacrifice should not cease; J and E were combined after the Fall of Jerusalem had brought about a reconciliation between Samaria and Judah; the reunion was assisted by a compromise by which Jerusalem became the sole national sanctuary while Bethel supplied its priesthood, this arrangement being embodied in D. Meanwhile the Babylonian Jews had reformed Judaism on paper in P, and the four documents E J D P were combined later to form the basis of the reconstruction under Nehemiah and Ezra.

This theory is largely influenced by Kennett's dislike of sacrifice, the *legal* authority for which he wished to put as late as possible, and by his excessive scepticism about Israel's early history. Two statements illustrate this latter point: "Of the religious history of Israel under the Monarchy down to the middle of the ninth century B.C. we have little information"; "Israelite religious history may be said to begin about the middle of the ninth century B.C." (pp. 15-16). The former point may be illustrated by his effort, which we think unconvincing, to rid the Passover both of its early origin and of its peculiar significance (pp. 116 ff.). We think that the difficulty that the eighth-century prophets, and Jeremiah, opposed sacrifice is met by Kennett's own statement that "It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that at least till the time of Nehemiah and indeed much later there was as great a difference of opinion among those who professed the religion of Jehovah as there is among Christians at the present day" (p. 86). The reasons which Kennett gives (pp. 30 ff.) for supposing E to have originated as a code for the instruction of the mixed Samaritan multitude are equally available for the theory that it originated in the early days of the Monarchy as part of the effort to bring the unexterminated Canaanites within the religion of Yahweh. It is very hard to see how J could have been regarded as a suitable counter-blast to Josiah. Moreover, if it had originated so recently its authority as against E would have been so feeble that it is difficult to imagine N. Israel—now, according to Kennett, very much stronger than Judah (p. 95), and politically separated from it throughout the period we are considering (p. 76)—accepting the amalgamation of its own law-book with that of its recently fallen rival. Nor can we believe that so soon after the Fall of Jerusalem the Bethelite priesthood would have migrated to Jerusalem and consented to work a system set up by Josiah but discredited by his untimely death and swept away almost immediately by the Babylonian invasion—a system, moreover, which conflicted with their own law-book and which involved the destruction of their own altars. Finally, the differences between J and D in phraseology and theological



standpoint are against a theory which makes these documents originate so closely together in time and place.

In the essay on *Sacrifice* Kennett suggests that originally the raw flesh, as well as the blood and the fat, was regarded as a vehicle of life—though less potent, and therefore less dangerous to consume, than the blood and the fat; and that the significance of the eating of the living flesh was lost when the custom arose of cooking the flesh. This treatment of the Passover, in this essay and in one on *The Last Supper*, especially his discussion of Exod. xiii. 11-16 on p. 117, seems to us to shew that his theories were sometimes imposed upon the facts.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the essay called *The Grammar of Old Testament Study*, where he shews how easily words can deceive. The discussion of Eschatology on pp. 176 ff. leads to the startling conclusion that "eschatology is not to be found in the *canonical* Scriptures of the Old Testament," and that "there is no eschatology in many utterances of Jesus which are commonly regarded as eschatological" (p. 186). The way in which Dan. xii. is made to yield to this conclusion (pp. 181-185) is masterly.

The study of *The Last Supper*, though first published as recently as 1921, betrays little consciousness of questions which have since become acute. Even the Mystery hypothesis is dismissed in a sentence or two (p. 235), and Kennett seems unaware that there is any special difficulty about "This do," etc. (p. 215). The essay, however, is well worth study. Kennett argues that "whereas S. Mark and S. Matthew in some sense identify the contents of the cup with blood, S. Paul seems to avoid any such identification," yet urges that 1 Cor. x. 16 and xi. 27 seem to shew that, after all, St. Paul interprets the cup in the same way as did the Evangelists (p. 216). In a long paraphrase of our Lord's words in the Upper Room (pp. 228-229) Kennett seeks to elucidate the meaning which the words would have conveyed to the disciples, but we doubt very much whether so few words could have conveyed so much at the time. Kennett agrees that the words "imply a representation of Christ as the true Passover Lamb."

Professor Cook evidently thinks that scholars have not done justice to Kennett's main theories. This volume should draw attention again to work which is always stimulating, though not always convincing.

A. E. MORRIS.

THE SON OF GOD. By Karl Adam. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

The author of this book wages strenuous warfare against the materialistic outlook of twentieth-century thought, and in particular against the influence which it has exercised upon the Protestant theology of his own country. He emphasizes the inadequacy of the thought of the present day and its inability to provide man with an interpretation of the totality of Being, and so to satisfy his deepest intellectual and spiritual needs. "Western eyes are grown old, and can no longer see the whole reality. . . . By having been concentrated on the world of mere phenomena their capacity to see the superterrestrial and the Divine has been weakened." Hence men have lost belief in the Godhead of Christ, or rather belief that he is not only God, but God-man; for in that fact, as the author points out, lies "the mystery of Christ." It is only because he is perfect God and perfect Man that Christians can claim Jesus as Mediator between man and God.



The author is particularly illuminating in his treatment of the relation of faith and reason in the understanding of the mystery of Christ. "It is only by the way of faith . . . that we can know the complete Christ. This faith is wholly and solely the act of God." But "this supernaturally begotten belief . . . rests on clear, historical insight into the credibility of Jesus and His works. *Per Jesum ad Christum.*" And "this judgment on the credibility of Jesus . . . first gains its overpowering, compelling force from the fact that it is informed and illumined by the grace of God." The task of the apologist is therefore first to shew that the Christ of the Gospels is a trustworthy portrait of Jesus of Nazareth, and secondly to shew that the figure portrayed is indeed the God-man whose Incarnation is the central doctrine of the Christian faith. The author therefore examines the sources for the life of Jesus, and then fulfils the latter part of his task in three chapters dealing with the Mental Stature, the Interior Life, and the Self-Revelation of Jesus. A chapter is devoted to a consideration of the evidence for the Resurrection and a critique of alternative hypotheses; and the final chapter discusses the Atonement.

The task is on the whole performed clearly and convincingly; and a word of especial praise is due to Mr. Philip Hereford for the clear and beautiful English translation which he has written. The book is a valuable piece of apologetic, especially in its positive exposition of the Christ who is portrayed in the Gospels; yet it just misses being a first-rate work. This is partly due to a rather too swift and facile brushing aside of theories with which the author disagrees. Eminent theologians, however Protestant and Liberal, ought not to be treated in so cavalier a fashion; and Karl Adam's speedy disposal of their views is not the less irritating because the reader often finds himself in agreement with his conclusions. In the same way the author hardly admits the existence of any problem in regard to the authorship of the Fourth Gospel or the extent of its historicity. Nor does he touch on the problem of the extent of the knowledge of our Lord in His earthly life, a question which must be faced by any serious defender of the doctrine of the Incarnation. Our Lord's quotation of Psalm cx. is mentioned; but the author assumes its Davidic authorship. In fact the most serious difficulties which the apologist for the Catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ has to surmount are disregarded. And while there is much beauty and value in the author's exposition of the Atonement, we note that he assumes a somewhat literal interpretation of Genesis ii. and iii., and upholds the Augustinian doctrines of "original perfection" and "seminal identity."

The reader, therefore, who hopes to find in this book the signs of a nascent Liberalism in Roman Catholic theology will be disappointed. Yet those who are able to sift the gold from the dross will find much of apologetic value in the author's argument, and much, even where they least agree with him, which will provoke thought.

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE AND DECORATION. By J. Arnott Hamilton, B.D., Ph.D. B. T. Batsford. 18s. 1933.

Dr. Arnott Hamilton has produced this excellent piece of work for the benefit of the general reader. He may be assured that such readers owe him a debt of gratitude for writing so valuable and readable a book.



All those whose interest in Byzantine Culture and Civilization has been quickened in recent years will find in this work an admirable and scholarly account of the origin and development of Byzantine Architecture and Art in relation to its "historical and social setting."

All that Dr. Arnott Hamilton has to say is written not only lucidly, but most sympathetically from the religious point of view.

The second chapter, which deals with the "Constructional Form of the Byzantine Church," ushers the uninitiated into the constructional problems of the style in an exceptionally interesting manner. One would be dull indeed not to grasp the principle of the pendentive after having read this chapter. Dr. Arnott Hamilton makes it quite clear that the pendentive originated in the East. The third chapter, dealing with the "Earlier Churches in Constantinople and Salonika . . . Byzantine Art in Ravenna, Naples and Rome," contains a fascinating description of the great church of Santa Sophia, together with those of S. Irene, S. Sergius, S. Bacchus, S. Sophia, Salonika, and also the famous and beautiful churches of S. Vitale and S. Apollinare, Ravenna. The subsequent chapters, with the exception of chapter vii., which covers the later churches of Constantinople, carry the reader through Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Egypt, Armenia, Georgia, Greece, the Balkans and Russia. In the course of these chapters Dr. Arnott Hamilton has a great deal more than ordinary information to impart, and especially concerning the churches of Armenia. Those interested in Russian ecclesiastical architecture will find much to interest them with regard to the relationship which existed between Kiev and Byzantium. It was through Kiev that Byzantine influence passed to Novgorod. Western Europe is surveyed in chapter x. This chapter treats of buildings of the Palermitan type.

From Palermo the reader is transported to Southern Italy, Sardinia, Venice and France . . . it is pointed out that in all probability the church of S. Front, Périgueux, is not "the prototype of all domed churches in Southern France." Dr. Arnott Hamilton is careful to bring out in his work the definitely Liturgical purpose of the churches he describes, as also of the iconographical schemes of decoration, for this, it goes without saying, is essential to the right appreciation of the ecclesiastical buildings of the Orthodox East.

The first chapter forms a most useful introduction to the book as a whole from the historical side; if one may venture to say anything in criticism of this chapter it would be to express the wish that Dr. Arnott Hamilton had brought out more clearly the inner significance of the Iconoclastic Controversy, for, as Miss Alice Gardner pointed out in her life of Theodore of Studium, the matter cannot be conceived in terms of merely Puritan dislike for sacred pictures and superstition. The inner significance of the Iconoclastic Controversy is intimately related to the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The book is furnished with a large number of excellent photographic illustrations and plans, also several interesting isometric views well worth careful study. All who are deeply interested in the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church and her Liturgical Worship should secure this work. It is a book to be read with pleasure and close attention and, we may add, with a good historical atlas ready to hand.

IVAN R. YOUNG.



**THEOLOGICAL OUTLINES.** By Francis J. Hall, S.T.D. Revised by F. H. Hallock, S.T.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Hall was a conservative theologian, and a deeply respected teacher in the General Theological Seminary, New York. The publication of his *Theological Outlines* is timely in that it coincides with a widely felt need to return to the categories of classical theology. Systematic treatment brings a satisfaction of its own, and in this case system is wedded to clarity, wise sayings and suggestive definitions.

Of clarity the section on "the supernatural" (pp. 2-4) is a good example, and the section on the Vincentian canon (pp. 19-21) is fruitful in suggestion. And there are wise things said about Catenas (p. 21), and what is and what is not legitimate "development" of doctrine (pp. 22-24). Observe too the sentences about sin on page 163, and again, of the Resurrection: "Every so-called scientific objection to the Resurrection as described in the Gospels is really philosophical, and is based upon *a priori* denial of the possibility of miracles" (p. 207). "Involution" is a useful word to describe the Divine entry into the evolutionary process and has obvious advantages over "irruption" or "intervention."

But questions in criticism arise in the mind of the reader. Can we distinguish between "the inspiration of the Bible and that of the sacred writers"? (p. 26). We can admit that editors and compilers were inspired as well as writers, and that the Church, both of the old dispensation and of the new, was inspired to frame the Canon, but the distinction as Dr. Hall makes it admits of a use of proof texts, which is from the most reasonable critical standpoint indefensible. It is, for example, absurd to use Deut. xxxi. 16 as evidence for the condition of the departed (p. 283).

It is hardly to be expected that a book written in 1892 would meet all the problems which perplex post-war students at the points where theology touches the comparative study of religion, Anthropology, Psychology, and Scientific Humanism. Nor is the treatment of the problem of evil and of eschatology sufficient to the needs of the younger generation. Von Hügel is surely profoundly right in saying that the problem of evil arises in relation to man's *partial* freedom. If so, the possibility of sin is more than "a necessary incident in the moral probation of really free creatures" (p. 141).

Dr. Hallock in his work of revision has left Dr. Hall's text almost untouched, but in the added footnotes and bibliography he has brought it partially but not wholly up-to-date. The list of books is useful, but one would have liked to see von Hügel's *Eternal Life*, and Hicks' *Fullness of Sacrifice* included: and it is strange that *Mens Creatrix* is mentioned, but not *Christus Veritas*.

The book will be specially useful for reference, and as a summary to be read at the end of a series of theological seminars.

E. R. MORGAN.

**THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD.** Addresses and Sermons delivered at the Sixth Catholic Congress at Philadelphia. October, 1933. Morehouse Publishing Co. Milwaukee. 0-75c.

This little book of 150 pages gives the sermons and addresses delivered at the Congress of the American Episcopal Church held to celebrate the centenary of the Oxford Movement at Philadelphia in October, 1933. The purpose of the Congress is described as being, besides an occasion of



thanksgiving and witness, an endeavour to seek "God's grace and guidance that His Kingdom may come and His Will be done." Of the thirteen papers included some are historical, among them a very interesting address by Dr. Gavin on "The Development of the Revival," and others deal with particular aspects of the Catholic Faith and its relation to society and social conditions, with Missions, Personal Religion and Future Outlook. All these papers maintain a high standard; among them special mention might perhaps be given to the address of Fr. Hoffman, S.S.J.E., on "The Revival of Evangelism," reviewing various methods of Church revival, such as Parochial Missions—"perhaps their best work is to reconvert parishioners who have become formalistic, conventional, or lax in their churchmanship"—the following-up of a mission by the local clergy, "Schools of Prayer" and so forth. Another paper deals with Missionary Problems, especially as they affect the American Church. The addresses which direct attention more especially to personal religion include a striking paper by Dr. Urban, Professor of Philosophy in Yale University, on "The Practice of the Presence of God," pointing out the central place of the idea of God in the Christian Religion and the dangers of any mere theories of Humanism and the like. The Christian view of man, Christian "Humanism," is made what it is by the Christian thought of God. If that thought loses its central place, the idea of man is at once degraded. Mr. Will Spens contributes a thoughtful and valuable essay on "Authority," emphasizing the need both of free consent as against constraint, and of the witness of lives governed by Catholic ideals. Bishop Manning of New York writes on the "Future of the Kingdom," the future need of our special type of Catholicism, "scriptural, liberal and spiritual," and gives the warning that "a Catholicism which is not truly evangelical is dead." Altogether this book gives the English reader a striking and encouraging insight into the position of the Catholic Movement in the Sister Church in America.

Concurrently with the above volume we have received the first six numbers of a series of *New Tracts for New Times*. These tracts of about ten pages each deal with various aspects of the application of Religion to modern life, the necessity in face of the difficulties and upheavals of the present day of putting God's Kingdom first, the meaning of the Sacred Humanity for our generation, "The Mass and the Masses," and so on. The series is, it is hoped, to be continued monthly. Though written primarily of course for the American public, they are of equal interest on this side of the Atlantic as well. They are produced by the Morehouse Publishing Company.

W. R. V. BRADE.

---

ORTHODOXY SEES IT THROUGH. Edited by Sidney Dark. (Essays by Arnold Lunn, Father D'Arcy, S.J., Ruth Kenyon, J. G. Lockhart, the Rev. A. E. Baker, Dr. Kirk, Martin Shaw, Douglas Jerrold, and R. Ellis Roberts.) London: A. Barker, Ltd. 8s. 6d.

A clear book, a brave book, an admirable book. Here are ten authors, some Anglican Catholic, some Roman Catholic, agreeing to defend the same position: Orthodoxy has always held, holds now, and will always hold the answer to the questions What shall we believe? How shall we act? What is the nature of man? and Where is Beauty to be found? Man can only think rightly and act rightly when his relationship to God is



right. The right relationship to God is found through membership of the Church, the Mystical Body of our Lord. There is no other way.

The world is in chaos because it has organized itself apart from God. Wrong beliefs, false economics, unhappy marriages, cacophonous music, hideous painting, perverted psychology, all spring from the same root, man's severance from his Maker. This, with varying elaborations, is the theme of the whole book. From beginning to end there is no compromise with "the world," no concession to the natural viewed apart from the supernatural. Readers wearied with the vague and tentative gropings of men who should be leaders of thought will welcome these plain-spoken essayists.

Martin Shaw and R. Ellis Roberts are not, it is true, quite as definite as some of the writers, and Dr. Kirk breaks off rather suddenly when treating of the New Psychology. We feel that he had some further trenchant remarks in his mind, but was afraid that they might seem uncharitable. Orthodoxy, however, though it may be *suaviter in modo*, is bound to be *fortiter in re*; so perhaps Dr. Kirk will, in another edition, say what he wanted to say, only put it rather differently. Ruth Kenyon and J. G. Lockhart on Economics and Politics are both thoughtful and persuasive. The Rev. A. E. Baker on Orthodoxy and the Universe has compressed a great deal of matter into a few pages. Douglas Jerrold brilliantly proves rather too much.

The best of all the essays is that of Father D'Arcy, for one feels the spiritual power that lies behind it.

Arnold Lunn is concerned to demonstrate that the orthodox can be as clever as the unorthodox, but he proves nothing else, and gives a false impression of the rest of the volume. In spite of the lamentable title, the book is a serious contribution to modern thought.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

**THE ABYSSINIAN AT HOME.** By C. H. Walker, O.B.E. Late Sudan Civil H.B.M. Consul for Western Ethiopia. Sheldon Press. 7s. 6d.

As Abyssinia is a closed book to the majority of Westerners and the real life of this extremely interesting country is exceedingly difficult for a foreigner to discover, the late Consul at Addis Abeba has lifted a veil on an obscure corner of the globe in giving us an account of the Abyssinian at home, from the knowledge he gained by spending his furloughs among the people. The book is a translation of his Amharic notes made while the natives were speaking, and put together in chapters to read harmoniously. But no attempt has been made to render the form of the narratives into literary English, the whole having been written down exactly as the author heard the words from the lips of the quite illiterate provincials who told their tale in simple artless phrases.

The author is the compiler of the Amharic-English Dictionary and he began making conversation with the Abyssinians to learn the language and not to collect material concerning their customs and beliefs. Finding that the only way to get them to discourse at length on any subject was to discuss their own culture, he allowed them to wander at will and to provide unconsciously a fresh base for inquiry. The information was then sifted and put down in narrative form under various headings. No attempt has been made to write a history, as this has been done already by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, or indeed to deal exhaustively with Abyssinian



life and character. But enough has been told in this volume to give the general reader a very good idea of the principal beliefs and customs, and to give a lead to the serious student desirous of investigating details for himself. Furthermore, since the text can easily be rendered into Amharic, it is hoped that the book will be useful to those who wish to learn the language. If the references to the glossary of Amharic words at the end of the volume are a little tiresome sometimes to the reader, the dictionary and the method will doubtless be a boon to the linguistic student.

The opening chapters are devoted to birth rites, baptism, methods of education and guardianship. The functions of the priest as confessor follow, and after a description of the neck-cord worn by every Christian to distinguish him from a Moslem, an account is given of marriage, divorce and death ceremonies. The strenuous system of fasts reveals the disciplinary side of Abyssinian religion. In addition to the fifty-five strenuous days of Lent, when no one may eat even grain or drink water till after the sixth hour, and then only coffee, bread and vegetable sauce may be taken, the priests and "great men" observe the fast of the Apostles for forty-five days after Pentecost. Except during Eastertide, no meat, butter, milk, eggs or cheese may be eaten on Wednesdays and Fridays, unless Epiphany or Christmas happen to fall on one of these days of the week.

Among the ecclesiastical customs described, the Mahabbar, or Private Communion, is of interest, and the section on the Law raises questions which require further elucidation. Perhaps some day, having whetted our appetites, Mr. Walker will give us a more detailed account both of the social and religious organization in Abyssinia from the abundance of first-hand information he has collected, of which this stimulating volume contains only a carefully selected summary.

E. O. JAMES.

---

STORIES AND LESSONS. THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR HOME AND SCHOOL.

PART II. MOSES AND HIS TIMES. Marion Power. S.P.C.K. 3s. net.

This instalment of Miss Power's work makes us hope that she will not stop until she has dealt with the whole of the Old Testament. Teachers of children from about ten years of age and onwards could find no better book to help them, whether their work is done at home, in elementary, secondary or public school. The introductions to each lesson study give the teacher the necessary information with regard to the light shed by sound scholarship, and the lessons themselves embody this information with the greatest skill. All the time the Old Testament is being dealt with from the right angle, as the background of the New, and is being examined in that light.

A. R. BROWNE WILKINSON.

---

## BOOK NOTES

*Christ Triumphant.* An Anthology of Great Christian Experiences. Compiled by N. G. Allen and Unwin. 5s. *Love and Death.* An Anthology of Consolation. By R. Ursula Somervell. Methuen. 5s. The former book is intended to illustrate the experience of the Groups. It is interesting to note how little has been found to support the detailed guidance on which the Groups rely. The passages given shew for the



most part a sense of harmony such as is not specifically Christian. The second book is more distinctively literary and contains much exquisite poetry.

*A Simple form of Compline.* Heffer. 2s. The particular blend of Churchmanship and adaptation to modern needs which Westcott House represents is happily illustrated in this little book. Nothing better could be recommended for those who reserve a time early in the evening for mental prayer and for the last thing at night prefer a simple liturgical form with more variations than the traditional Compline affords.

*Lord Halifax. A Tribute.* By Sidney Dark. Mowbray. 2s. 6d. It would be a pity if a brief sketch "queered the pitch" for the later authoritative biography. But the public memory is short, the writing of a long and careful book takes time, and probably a good many will buy the quickly written sketch who will never read the later book. Mr. Dark's admirable little book is exactly what is needed at this stage; his account of recent ecclesiastical events is particularly good, being as kindly as it is frank.

*The Road from Rome.* By Archibald Campbell. Philip Allan. 2s. 6d. The chief interest in this well-written and attractive account of an Anglican priest who "went over" and returned lies in the revelation of the author's mental states. "My reason . . . was not theological; it had nothing to do with the pros and cons of the Roman and Anglican claims." Once inside the Roman Catholic Church, where the author experienced nothing but kindness and sympathy, he was confronted with the problem of Infallibility, and especially with fundamentalism in regard to the Bible. The required surrender of intellectual honesty was too great and he returned to the Anglican fold. It is all most instructive, as shewing the limits of usefulness of intellectual arguments. It is almost incredible, and yet true, that Mr. Campbell postponed facing the issues between Rome and Canterbury until after secession.

*Christ, Yesterday and Today.* By George B. Jeffrey. Allen and Unwin. 1s. 6d. A Swarthmore Lecture on the relation between the Christ of the present and the Jesus of the past, setting forth the principles of the Society of Friends. *Visitation Charge of the Bishop of Oxford.* Oxford University Press. 1s. The decline in churchgoing seems to have been arrested. No fewer than 170 parishes neglected to reply to the Visitation questions! *Outline of Teaching Sermons for a Third Year.* Edited by C. E. Hudson. Allen and Unwin. 2s. Admirable guidance for a few parishes. *Christianity and Conduct.* By Canon Barry and others. Methuen. 1s. Reprinted from *The Spectator*.

The remaining books are publications of the Faith Press. *Pain, Power, and Progress.* By H. E. Worledge. 9d. Thoughts on Suffering. *Through the Gates.* By Gertrude Hollis. 1s. 6d. A very simple devotional life of Christ. *The Church and the Onlooker.* By C. G. Bruce. 1s. A defence of Anglicanism, by one who "writes as he talks." *The Quest of the Soul.* By Dorothy Reynolds. 1s. 6d. Stories of Simon, a devout old toll-keeper.

W. K. L. C.